# THE CANADIAN EIGHT CANADIAN THE CANADIAN THE COLL BRAY AN STATE COLL BAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

Iwenty-Third Year of Issue

October, 1943

# Next Step for the CCF

Government or Opposition?

ANDREW BREWIN

# Can We Have Full Employment?

E. A. BEDER

# Report From England

L. W. HENDERSON

# Planning Post-War Canada

Mr. Macdonnell Replies To His Critics Leverplanners Seek To Salvage Capitalism

Vol. XXIII, No. 273

TORONTO, ONTARIO, OCTOBER, 1943

Twenty-five Cents

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSU
O CANADA
EDITORIALS
WHAT KIND OF WAR ARE WE FIGHTING?
NEXT STEP FOR THE CCF—  Andrew Brewin
CAN WE HAVE FULL EMPLOYMENT?— E. A. Beder
THE UNBUTTONED MANNER—  Eleanor Godfrey
FALL THOUGHTS— P. K. Page
ODE: THE EUMENIDES— A. J. M. Smith
MUTABLE HEARTS—  Margaret Avison
PLANNING POST-WAR CANADA  Mr. Macdonnell Replies to His Critics Leverplanners Seek to Salvage Capitalism  "Of Things To Come"
REPORT FROM ENGLAND—  L. W. Henderson
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN CANADA—  Douglas MacLennan
BOOKS OF THE MONT
SOCIAL SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION IN CANADAF. R. Scott
SECURITY FOR CANADIANSLaura Jamieson
NEW WRITING AND DAYLIGHT Roy Daniells

#### THE CANADIAN FORUM

CORRESPONDENCE ..

Eleanor Godfrey - Managing Editor Alan Creighton - Assitant Editor L. A. Morris - Business Manager

Published each month by

CANADIAN FORUM LIMITED
28 Wellington Street West, Toronto 1, Ontario, Canada
Telephone WA. 5118

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: TWO DOLLARS A YEAR Typography: Service Linotyping Co., Toronto Press Work: Merchants Press, Toronto.

#### O CANADA

Winnipeg, Aug. 27 (CP)—Politicians and what he described as "half-baked reformers," have been making brave promises for a post-war Canada without offering any contributions to practical plans of reconstruction, Senator J. W. de B. Farris, Vancouver, told members of the Empire Club at a luncheon meeting here . . .

"It is a crime to add a condition of further reaction, built up by false hopes," Senator Farris said. "These hopes will arise from a travagant promises, foolish experiments. They will defeat their puposes by spreading jealousies and class hatred." The masses of the people, he added, would never profit from the exploitation of those who are more prosperous, as any policy designed to divide weak would only succeed in dividing the poverty.

(Leader-Post, Regina, Sask., August 28, 1943)

Grinning, Distinguished Flying Cross winner, Flt. Lieut.

son of Mr. and Mrs. ———, returned home last night with eight Nazi scalps to his credit. Veteran of some 140 fighter sweeps, Fl. Lieut. ———— grins here with his sister, left, and his mother, centre.

(Caption under cut in Globe and Mail, August 26, 194)

Now, in 1943, another wave of dissatisfaction has developed, the time centred around the CCF, a party that is really socialistic, but which made its appeal to Ontario electors on democratic grounds.

(Vancouver Daily Province, September 9, 1943)

The Premier said some weeks ago the logging and lumbering industry would be fully consulted before the government appoints a commission to make a detailed survey of the industry.

(Victoria Daily Times, September 13, 194)

Use Canucks as Needed 'In Whole or in Part,' Says Gen. McNaughton. (Headline in Globe and Mail, August 27, 1941)

The New York market continues to remain in an irregular and indefinite trend with traders apparently being unable to decide as to whether the excellent news from the Russian front can be construed as being favorable, or otherwise, to security prices.

(Stock Market Forecast, issued by Investors Advisory Counsel, August 31, 1943)

Stoker Mechanic Gordon J. (Buster) Turnbull, young veteran wh has helped sink a couple of subs, who has battled Atlantic gales is getting supplies to North Africa, who has been through Mediterranea dive-bombings and was one of thousands of other Canadians at Sicily party, has been ordered to report for military training. The Department of Labor, National Resources Mobilization Act, 1944. National Selective Service Mobilization Regulations, it says on the slip of paper, are ordering Gordon J. Turnbull to go and set physician within three days after which, if he is found "fit," a time and place will be indicated for military training.

(Globe and Mail, August 26, 194)

Far-seeing people are suddenly realizing we have a Senate, and the it can veto legislation. There are no CCFers in the Upper Chambe

(Canadian Business, September, 1943)

Rt. Hon. Baron Wright, of Burley, Lord of Appeal in Ordinary and member of the judicial committee of the House of Lords... preferred not to speak of the war since, he said, no one, except perhape Prime Minister Churchill, knew much about it . . About the perhape war period, "everyone has different ideas," and that was better left those who were working on plans for that period. In England Ministry of Works and Planning was preparing for all configencies . . . (Daily Colonist, Victoria, B.C., September 4, 1941)

A great many of the more than sixty exhibitors at the Torest Gift Show this week anticipate an orgy of spending this Christman "People are lousy with money and as gullible as all-get-out!" was been one exhibitor frankly summed up the situation to Marketing. "Beeness is going to be far too good. The market will be crazy, with list merchandise but lots of junk!" he added, strictly on his own accounts.

(Marketing, September 4, 194)

This month's prize of six months' subscription goes to D. B. Ams Avonlea, Sask. All contributions should contain original clipping, du and name of publication from which taken. deep endin itself forcir of po

the re

T

lau

bee

and

part

thou

over

polit least

In

Cana

Desp

force to ke

unea

Mu to cha much Board

reports tive in minori for qui

refusin made it was as return. Mr. Jo this tim must ei

Mr. uniting Trades encoura action,' adopted affiliate

Perha Labor to through of Mr. 1 ing his very fiel

# THE CANADIAN FORUM

Vol. XXIII, No. 273

THE R

ed as

m ex-

tnox wealth

1943)

eight s, Fit.

1943)

d, this

ic, but is.

1943)

dustry

mmis

1943)

n. Mc-

, 1943

ar and

e as to

vestor

an who

gales is

rranen at the

g. The i, 1940, on the l see i a time

, 1943

nd that

r, 1943

rdina

perhapine posi-r left to and the

contin

4, 1943

Toront

ristms was how "Bus-ith lith account

4, 194

Anni ing, dat

23

Founded 1920

Toronto, Ontario, October, 1943

#### The Real Issue

Another September draws to a close, and the world is launched on its fifth year of global war. Mr. Churchill has been able to give the world a picture of the tide steadily engulfing the fascist enemies which has stirred every heart, and to hold out the "hope" that at long last the leading partners in this revolutionary war may march in full accord towards victory and its fulfilment in a better world. But though the crucial "second" front which will clinch victory over the Nazis exists, it will not go into operation "under political pressure." This means we almost certainly face at least another year of war with Germany.

In Canada, a government which has presided over the greatest concerted effort towards a single objective the Canadian people have ever made, is under increasing fire. Despite the most determined attempt in Canadian history to force a fictitious issue on the people, Mr. King has managed to keep the country, under pressure of war, in a state of uneasy "unity." But underlying the united desire for military success, upon which everything else is predicated, the deep resolve of the common man to make this a people's war ending in a people's peace has solidified, and has expressed itself in the rise of a new party, whose growing power is forcing the old parties into belated and hurried revisions of policy. Fictitious lines of divisions are disappearing, and the real issue is becoming clearer every day.

#### Still No Labor Policy

Muddle, confusion, secrecy and utter ineptitude continue to characterize the Federal Government's labor policy. The much advertised inquiry held by the National War Labor Board has come to nothing, except more delay and more reports. The chairman joined with the employers' representative in issuing a majority report and Mr. J. L. Cohen sent in a minority report. These have been in the government's hands for quite a while now, but they have not been made public.

When Mr. Cohen tried to force the government's hand by refusing to attend any more sittings until the government made up its mind on policy and published the reports, he was asked to resign. He refused. Instead, he offered to return. The government then terminated his appointment. Mr. John A. Bell has been appointed in his place. But by this time it is surely quite obvious that a labor representative must either go along with the reactionary elements or quit.

Mr. Humphrey Mitchell has had considerable success in uniting labor—against himself and the old parties. The Trades and Labor Congress convention early this month encouraged its affiliated unions to seek "independent political action," and a week later the Canadian Congress of Labor adopted a resolution recommending to its unions that they affiliate with the CCF.

Perhaps we are wrong, however, to give the Minister of labor the credit. Did he not say he would follow his skipper through thick and thin? What we really have is the spectacle of Mr. Mackenzie King, that clever political strategist, leading his party straight to disaster by incompetency in the very field in which he was once supposed to be an expert.

#### Sins of the Fuebrers?

We are glad to see that the editor of Saturday Night seems no longer to hold the view that "it does not seem of the first importance now to distinguish between the Germans who are 'responsible' and those who are not 'responsible' " for starting the war. This change is implicit in his approving comments on a CBC broadcast in which Dr. R. M. Coper declared, as quoted by Mr. Sandwell, that: "The managing class in German industry is practically solid in its Nazism, and cannot possibly be left in control; and the properties cannot be turned over to new private owners. Any policy of a United Nations government which looks towards preventing this socialization is dangerous, because it can only end in the maintenance in power of a large group of the guilty men of 1939 and the preceding years.'

As Mr. Sandwell points out, "unconditional surrender" need not be an excuse for visiting the sins of the fuehrers upon the people. He thinks that the latter should be informed, just as Stalin has informed them of the Russian intentions, that Great Britain and the United States are also aiming at "something considerably short of reducing Germany to perpetual helplessness." But the silence and, more important, the behavior in North Africa and Italy, leave us wondering whether any distinction exists in the minds of Anglo-American leaders between those who are responsible and those who are not responsible for the war.

#### The CCF and the Communists

When the Communists founded the Labor-Progressive party last month, they were careful not to admit any communist doctrines into its statements and platforms. Democracy was the catchery and the word revolution might never have existed. The next step was to seek affiliation with the

At Calgary on September 6, the application was bluntly refused by the National Council of the CCF, which issued a statement for its reasons. Why, it asked, have the Communists formed a new party? If they have been converted to the need for democratic methods in social change, there is no need for a new party; if they have not, then affiliation is impossible. The statement then goes on to explain the basic differences between democrats and communists at every stage; it reviews the disruptive role played by communists in the past, their recent abrupt changes of policy that led them into the arms even of Mitch Hepburn, proving "the Communist party to lack any sense of responsibility to the people of Canada." The formation of the Labor-Progressive party is denounced as contrary to the professed aim of unity in the labor movement.

This statement will no doubt be denounced as coming from leaders and contrary to the desire of rank and file. Yet anyone who knows the CCF also knows that it expresses the opinion of the vast majority of its members. Indeed any other position would have been contrary to all convention decisions on the subject. The CCF provides a channel for political action for those who believe in social changes by democratic methods, and it means to keep that channel clear.

#### We Oblige The Free Press

The Winnipeg Free Press, quoting our remark that "the electors in The Pas can no longer be fooled about social security measures by the helpless cry, 'Where will the money come from'," pleads with us to tell it where the money would come from in a planned economy. It says:

"The Canadian Forum, we hope, is far too intelligent to believe that the money is going to come out of the profits of business. It knows that even if it socialized all business and industry, the whole of the profits would not produce

what was needed, or anything like it."

But that is precisely what we do not know—and neither does the Free Press. On the contrary, there are excellent reasons for knowing that if our resources, human and material, were made fully productive under a democratically integrated plan by which profits were available for social purposes instead of going largely to enrich private individuals, there would be ample money, both for economic expansion and for social security measures. Moreover, unlike the Free Press, we do believe that socialized industry could help to produce these surpluses by eliminating waste and achieving an efficiency impossible in our present economy.

There is no use in the Free Press asking us to answer its question "by analyzing the present source of the national income," which of course is partly derived from a swollen overseas market for war goods. Even with this greatly increased income, we admit, Premier Garson is quite right in failing to see where the money is to come from-as long as we cling to our outmoded system of private capitalism. That is precisely the point that the electors of The Pas perceived. International trade, after the war, as the Free Press points out, will be as necessary to Canada under a planned as under an unplanned economy, and will depend partly on international factors. But our chances of obtaining foreign markets for our surplus goods will be much greater where transactions are co-ordinated by import and export boards than where they are left to the haphazard and competitive scramble of private dealers. That is something we do not expect the Free Press to admit-but it is true. Guess we must be among those "impracticable" people to whom the Free Press refers. Dictionaries say that the word, applied to persons, means "unmanageable, obstinate."

#### The Two Great Gulfs

In Canada, especially, where so many people seem to take it for granted that the salvation of the world lies in an alliance between the British Empire and the United States, the finding of a commission appointed by the American Federation of Teachers and the American Federation of Labor to study education and the post-war world deserves careful thought. The report was written by John L. Childs, vice-president of the teachers' federation, and co-author of a recent book, reviewed in this journal, calling on the Soviet Government to dissolve the Comintern—another report of this joint teacher-labor committee—which was followed shortly afterwards by the world-shaking announcement that the Comintern had, in fact, decided to dissolve itself. In Mr. Childs' words, as reported in the press, the finding is this:

If we want world security and peace, we shall not choose the policy of an Anglo-American alliance. That way lies war! Difficult as it unquestionably is, if we want to create conditions for economic progress and political security, we must build bridges across two great gulfs. One is the gulf that divides the capitalist democracies from Communist Russia. Only as we create conditions that make real co-operation with Soviet Russia possible can we have a stable world situation. The second is the gulf between the white world and the

colored world. Our post-war conditions must satisfy deep moving aspirations of the people of China, India, and the so-called colonial peoples or we shall not have peace.

We commend these words to those who see in an exclusively Anglo-Saxon world hegemony the solution of all our international difficulties.

#### Is This An Indication?

The clumsy attempt of the government to deal with the demands for wage adjustments and at the same time safeguard the anti-inflation wage-price ceiling by introducing child allowances, which is being foreshadowed in Ottawa dispatches as we write, has met with deserved protests from labor. A measure which should be considered as part of a general social security plan is here being suggested as a means of extricating the government from the consequences of its confused and dilatory attitude towards labor's demands for an equitable distribution of the war's burdens. It shows a lamentable tendency to postpone constructive decisions on both wages and social security, and labor has not been slow to see the fly in the ointment. Inspired Ottawa dispatches also foreshadow an imminent announcement of the government's plans for post-war reconstruction. We trust that this evasive mode of dealing with wages is no indication of the spirit in which the government proposes to "solve" our post-war problems.

Social security committees for the past two years have been dealing with various aspects of post-war problems, and not only have they failed to suggest any integrated plan for dealing with them, but there have been clear signs that what the government contemplates is simply turning our productive machinery back into private hands. None of the "plans" emanating from industrial and business organizations indicate that they have any proposals for curing our economic ills save a resumption of the same old scramble for profits—with the government standing by, oil can in hand, to grease the wheels. We await the government's announcement with

interest

#### **Substitute For Thought**

The rash of tag days that has covered the face of Canadian cities for the past year is one indication of the haphazard and illogical manner in which we handle our social services under capitalism. The genius who invented this method of extracting money from the people-along with the fellowgenius who dreamed up Mother's Day-knew how to capitalize human inertia, sentimentality and simianism. The result is that hundreds of "causes"-good, bad and indifferent-are able to obtain funds by providing an excuse for well-meaning but mentally lazy people to shirk the real job of organizing a sane society. Neither taggers nor tagged, by and large, have the remotest understanding of what they are collecting or surrendering money for. The danger of tag days is that they flatter the vaguely humanitarian and benevolent impulse which exists in most people, thereby further discouraging them from bringing their minds to bear on our economic and social problems. The result is that "organized charity" takes the place of effective organization to end poverty, ill-health and economic servitude.

#### **War Note**

That popular and satisfying Canadian dish which used to be listed on restaurant bills of fare as Spaghetti à l'Italienne, but which, following the "stab in the back," became Spaghetti With Meat Sauce, is once more appearing under its former (French) name.

alarr enthistrug little than murd made were demo

0

gres

fact

wer

cata

Brit

the

It

days

T

to pr them endar witho viewe Soviet raised of cer Nazisi

The at wor between stalled became who be vented looked bred si leaders Spain side of inclined perhaps

that the of Bols responde Europe people interest to have remain

Govern

With The Br the new failure a better magnific

to be d

# What Kind of War Are We Fighting?

#### Editorial

ne e ng ra m a a es e ns. ve

ve nd

or nat ncns" linic

ces of ►WITH DEEP DISILLUSIONMENT and dismay, progressively minded people in Canada are awaking to the fact that this war may become, not the war we thought we were fighting, but the prelude to greater and more devastating cataclysms.

This possibility no one who has followed the drift of British and American policy, military and political, during the past two years can any longer afford to ignore.

It is well to review what has taken place since those early days of September four years ago. At the start many people, alarmed though they were by the Nazi shadow, had little enthusiasm for the war. It looked too much like another struggle for power, in which the motives on either side had little more to commend themselves to the common people than those which had plunged nations into orgies of mass murder on previous occasions. The attempts that had been made to appease the German Nazis suggested that those who were leading us into war were doing so less to protect the democratic freedoms about which they talked so much than to preserve the privileges which democracy had permitted them to enjoy, already threatened from within but now endangered in a different and more imminent way from without. The hatred with which these leaders and their kind viewed the "Russian experiment," their disposition to regard Soviet Russia rather than Nazi Germany as the real enemy, raised doubts even in the minds of those who were critical of certain things in Russia but who had no illusions about

The long months of "phony" war hinted that forces were at work to turn the war into a mutually exhausting struggle between Germany and Russia. Stalin seemed to have forestalled this with the Russian-German pact, and many people became bitter against Russia who were not Russophobes, but who believed that the Soviet government could have prevented war had it come in on the allied side. They overlooked the long years of ostracism and hatred which had bred suspicion of the democracies in the minds of Russian leaders. Similarly, the sorry tale of Manchuria, Abyssinia, Spain and Czechoslovakia had made many people on this side of the Atlantic distrustful of British leadership and inclined to keep clear of the European cauldron. They failed, perhaps, to see how far-reaching was the fascist threat. Governments which had most reason to know how serious that threat was had confused the issue through their hatred of Bolshevism; and it is small wonder that the foreign correspondents who were observing things at first hand in Europe were like voices crying in the wilderness, for many people tended to mistake their warnings as an echo of selfinterested warmongers. Even now, some of those who claim to have envisaged from the first the full extent of the menace remain blind or inimical to the profounder issues that have emerged from those early days of doubt and confusion.

With the fall of France, the war became a people's war. The British people forced the appeasers out and rallied to the new leadership they themselves had set up. Their early failure to force their government to work with Russia for a better world was at least partially expiated by their magnificent resistance to Nazi air power and their refusal to be drawn into the plot to crush Russia. And, if the

Russian-German pact was a tragic blunder, it too has been expiated by the Russians in the past two years. If Americans were slow to see how their interests were involved, they also have paid the price at Pearl Harbor, on Pacific beaches and on the bloody battlefields of the Mediterranean.

There is little room for recriminations. The thing to consider now is what kind of war we are really fighting. Beginning so badly, filled with such tragic blunders and reverses at the start, and emerging finally as a people's war, with the issues clear in the minds of most of those who are doing the fighting and working, how far has it retained that character, and if not where is it heading?

Ultimate military victory is now assured. Mere complacency or weariness are not likely to reverse the trend now in our favor, and our might is growing with every month. Unless our military leaders commit incredible blunders, sooner or later our arms will prevail. The one thing that can hamper that march is the feeling that the hopes and sacrifices which have sustained us and enlisted full popular support for this war have been betrayed—that those at the top have no intention of permitting it to become a war of liberation for the common people. Unfortunately, there is more than enough ground for such a feeling.

The tenderness towards Vichy and the appeasement of Franco; the deal with Darlan, the cold-shouldering of de Gaulle and the grudging and limited recognition of the French National Committee of Liberation; the fostering of governments in exile, some of which do not represent their people; the treatment of India; the cautious and equivocal procedure of the allied military government in Sicily—these have been followed by acceptance of the doubtful Badoglio government in Italy and the incredible stupidity, if not worse, of allowing Mussolini to evade capture (for which Mr. Churchill had no satisfactory explanation).

Some of these things might be excused on the score of military necessity or temporary expediency. Not so the refusal of Britain and the United States to declare their post-war intentions towards Germany, while influential voices continue to talk of dismemberment and subjugation. Nothing to offer but unconditional surrender and military occupation; nothing to arouse the hopes and enlist the support of those Germans who hate their masters and are prepared to help throw them off. To France we hold out merely the promise—rendered suspect by our dealings with ex-Vichyites in North Africa—that her people will be allowed to decide what kind of government they want.

On the other hand, Soviet Russia, through the Free Germany Committee, has offered the German people guarantees of a democratic reconstruction after the Nazis have been defeated and punished. Not a Communist regime, but a liberal democratic order; not dismemberment, but a strong Germany with a strong army purged of the Prussian military caste which has served the Nazis so well. True, Churchill has declared "Nazism and Prussian militarism" to be the twin targets of allied vengeance. But beyond that, nothing save the vague generalities of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. Did not Roosevelt declare, when asked about allied plans for post-war Germany: "We have none." Asked about France, he said: "There is no France." As for Canadian leadership, Mr. King has been content to play the adoring satellite to Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. The voice that Canada, as a major contributor to the allied war effort, might have raised in the name of the Common Man has been carefully attuned to the seductive duet of her two big partners.

There is no longer any attempt to conceal the differences that exist between the Anglo-American and the Soviet leaders. On matters of grand military strategy there may be room for honest divergency. It may be that delaying the main European invasion until air assaults have further sapped the Nazi strength would ensure a less costly victory—for British and American troops. It may be that an invasion now, entailing heavy casualties though it would, might shorten the war at a smaller total expense of men. It would almost certainly relieve the burden on Russia, and we can forgive Stalin for favoring this course, though it were on that score alone.

But this is not the basic cause of friction, though it may well be contributory to the main one. Doubts about ultimate Anglo-American intentions are what really hinder full Soviet-British-American accord. As long as these intentions remain negative, clouded or inimical to the liberating spirit which alone can give meaning to this struggle, those who regard the war as a genuine war of liberation—and that includes not only the Russians but the oppressed masses in Germany and the Nazi-occupied countries as well as the great majority of people in the democracies—must remain suspicious and uneasy.

Unfortunately, omens on the democratic home fronts are even less propitious. As long as people could be persuaded that the war effort demanded all our energies, that nothing mattered but victory, that we should not even think about what was to come after-the voices of reaction remained silent, while their owners busied themselves in consolidating their economic power. But now that the voice of the Common Man can no longer be silenced, the hounds of reactionin Canada, in the United States, in Britain—are in full cry. What we are fighting for, they boom, is not freedom, but something called "free enterprise," and they leave no doubt that, whether we believe them or not, they mean to lead us again down that garden path. They can summon the highest witnesses. Has not Mr. Churchill himself said, with satisfying pointlessness: "We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or the official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privilege"? Time was when the people, who have seen enough of privilege and have a strange yen for security and equality, might have called a witness of their own-one occupying an equally exalted position. But who now cares to appeal to the champion once hailed as the inaugurator of a New Deal, the doughty fighter who seemed bent on giving fresh meaning to the American Dream, but who now rebukes others when they presume to take up the lance he has laid aside?

What is happening on the high political fronts and behind the screen of the war effort at home is all of a piece. The timid, the cautious and the designing are joining forces to keep this war from becoming the war of the Common Man against economic and political enslavement wherever it exists and whether it issue from governments abroad or at home. To influence the course of events will require an assertion of the popular will wider and more unmistakable than any yet manifested. If the next era is to be the era of the Common Man, he will have to look sharp, and forge his own instruments of political action now.

In Canada, the CCF party can, if it will, become the rallying point of all those who see this war as a struggle for human rights. In this revolutionary moment in the world's history, revolutions must begin at home. Only so will those who sit at the peace table be representative of the majority in every country who have most to gain from a peaceful and co-operative world.

## Next Step for the CCF— Government or Opposition?

Andrew Brewin

There is a tide in the affairs of men Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; Omitted, all the voyage of their life Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

► THE CCF may be pardoned a momentary glow of satisfaction with the results of the Ontario election. Achieved with a minimum of financial support and a great deal of violent, untruthful and well-financed opposition, the results may be attributed to sound planning, to effective use of limited resources, to genuine democratic enthusiasm of many volunteers, and to the good sense of Ontario voters.

But self-satisfaction is a dangerous sentiment, and it is now necessary for the CCF to grasp the implications of its

present success and go on from there.

The most significant conclusion to be drawn from the Ontario election is that it is now possible to speak of a CCF government for Canada after the next Federal election as a reasonable probability, or at least a far from remote contingency. Until the resistance of at least one of Canada's central provinces to the need for social democracy had been broken down, such a prospect was remote indeed. South York, to those who did not accept the myth of Mackenzie King's responsibility for that happy event, foreshadowed—and Gallup polls clearly indicated—the revolutionary changes developing in Canada's political set-up. Only an actual battle at the polls could put the matter to the test.

The CCF must now recognize anew the urgency of its opportunity. Many CCF members, including some CCF leaders, are "opposition-minded," if not "group-minded." This is very natural. For most of its history the role of the CCF has been that of a voice crying in the wilderness, a conscience informing, animating, goading old parties into some overdue reforms. The character of Mr. Woodsworth predisposed the party to such an attitude, although it was a part of his genius to realize that it was not enough, and to lay the foundations for a political movement with an even higher responsibility.

There are today many in the CCF who think that it would be best for the CCF to gain experience as an Official Opposition in the next Dominion Parliament. So it would be—in theory, and if the urgencies of the historic crisis did not

demand a different view.

Mr. Coldwell was misquoted in a comment on the results of the Ontario election. He said that those results made it clear that the CCF would at least form the Official Opposition after the next election. Headlines and some reports omitted the words "at least," and other CCF leaders repeated the misquotation. These statements have lent color to the view that the CCF aspirations are confined to forming an opposition. Unfortunately, the incorrect version of Mr. Coldwell's remarks represents for too many members of the CCF a reasonable target at which to aim.

It is the purpose of this article to suggest that anything short of a determined effort to take over the responsibility of government would be a betrayal of the people of Canada at a historic moment, and might deprive the CCF forever of an opportunity for effective service. The notion that the CCF can advance by gradual stages, at five or ten year intervals, from a small minority group to an official opposition, and finally to the position of government in the fulness of time, is a mechanical theory unrelated to actual probabilities of

fact.
would
take pi
bers sle
the rev
impend
those v
With

Octo

order already contribution only by U.S.S.J. Canada more is by the aging Liberal could be social of the social of t

putting wealth about (of Free apparer the An well-bei security ernmen It is peace e

problen

little un failures pitiable examina would eing solo war ind sion that ists. The their fa the skill prevent edly wi

proved disaster

The full employment full employment for need able to puth the CC

individu

Back even so familiar expected fall vici

approac must no must no like the assistan

systems. trative of be hood is ts fact. Such a gradual gaining of parliamentary experience would obviously be ideal if the development of a party could take place in a vacuum. But while the CCF's elected members slowly reached a stage of perfect preparedness for office, the revolutionary temper of the times and the depth of the impending crisis might well have swept into oblivion all those who were unready to grasp time by the forelock.

Within one, two or three years, the war will in all probability be over. The task of establishing a secure world order on solid foundations of economic justice is upon us already, and will grow more urgent every hour. In material contributions to the struggle against Fascism, Canada stands only behind the United States, Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. Can we view with satisfaction the prospect of Canada being represented at the Peace Conference, and more important still on the instruments of world planning, by the sterile imperialism of the Tories or the not less damaging little-Canadianism of our querulous, self-conscious Liberals? On the other hand, how decisive a contribution could be made to a just and durable peace by the united social democracies of Canada, Australia and New Zealand putting some real meaning into the phrase "British Commonwealth of Nations!" Even now, do Canadians feel happy about Canada's influence, or the lack of it, in the treatment of Free France, of Badoglio and his neo-Fascists, and the apparently growing estrangement between the U.S.S.R. and the Anglo-American capitalist democracies? For her own well-being, Canada's contribution to world order and world security requires that she be represented by a CCF Govemment at the earliest opportunity.

It is a commonplace that the transition from a war to a peace economy will, in Canada as elsewhere, create grave problems. However, the magnitude of these problems is little understood. Even CCF members who proclaim the failures of capitalism do not always appreciate the pitiable inadequacy of "private enterprise" for the task. An examination of the actual proposals of leading businessmen would enlighten them. It is a commonplace that our returning soldiers, sailors and air force men and our workers in war industry will not gently accept the new and deep depression that is inevitable if we take the advice of our industrialists. The old parties have been frank enough in proclaiming their faith in "private enterprise," which finances them. All the skillful and expensive propaganda in the world should not prevent the CCF from making it clear, as the facts undoubtby will in the long run, that relying on institutions and individuals who so patently failed to deliver the goods, and proved their utter bankruptcy, can bring only chaos and disaster. The CCF must be ready to step into the breach.

The urgency and crucial necessity of social planning for full employment at the earliest possible moment (and only governments can command the resources to do this), and the need for power in the hands of governments willing and able to put such plans into execution, demand that in Canada the CCF be ready to take over at the earliest possible moment.

Back of the old social democratic weakness which makes even some convinced socialists "opposition-minded" is the familiar besetting sin of false modesty. Its enemies can be expected to proclaim loudly the CCF's inexperience. Is it to fall victim itself to their propaganda? Any group which approaches the task of government in this fateful hour must necessarily do so with complete humility. But this must not be false humility. Parties based upon the people, like the CCF, have inexpressibly richer resources of expert assistance and alert administration than the relicts of outworn systems. No one intimately acquainted with the administrative capacities of our present political leaders is likely to be hoodwinked by any false suggestions as to their qualifi-

cations through experience. Most of the experience gained in governments and legislatures in the past thirty years is of the sort to disqualify rather than qualify its possessors for effective service in the new era that is upon us. Let us not be deceived. We need to elicit in the years that are to come far greater experience, ability and expert knowledge than have been known in government before in this country and we must start to do it now. But only a people's party such as the CCF can hope to enlist that type of assistance in government. It must abolish, first from its own mind and then from the minds of others, the myth that experience in the type of politics we have known in the past is a present qualification for office.

Incidentally, the CCF alone appears to have reasonable hope of forming what newspaper editors call a "stable" government, by attracting sufficient popular support to win an over-all majority. The Liberals are on the way out, and let none of them get away with the suggestion that this is because they have been the instrument for imposing war measures too extreme to suit the Canadian people, or because of some inevitable unpopularity of war governments. Smuts has just been returned in South Africa, the Labor Parties in Australia and New Zealand have also been recently re-elected. Churchill and Roosevelt stand higher in popular support than ever before. So that particular excuse for the unpopularity of the Canadian Government will not do. The collapse of the Liberal Party, the failure of the Conservatives to make substantial progress in the only province in which they could hope for substantial support, and the apparent determination of Quebec to go off on a separatist frolic of her own, all point in the same direction.

The CCF must then recognize the urgency of the task before it. It must as a natural consequence enlist a wider and more representative membership. No person of good-will who sees at all the importance of the political struggles that are coming at this cross-roads of history can afford to be an onlooker. Particularly must the CCF draw into its ranks the representatives of the farmers of Eastern Ontario. The Bracken play, as it might be called, was, on the old pattern of "divide and rule," designed to split farmer and industrial worker and tie up the farmer to capitalism, although no group would benefit more from full employment, effective social planning and control of monopolies than the farmer. The spokesmen of capitalism have asserted with glee that the CCF in Ontario elected no representatives from farm constituencies, and have hailed this as the result of some natural incompatibility between the CCF and the farmers and as an illustration of the futility of trying to unite farmers and industrial workers in one democratic party. Apart from their error of fact (George Lockhart, CCF member for Rainy River, is a farmer from a farming constituency), their satisfaction is based upon their usual inadequate examination of the realities of the case. The truth of the matter is that to the CCF the most encouraging feature of the recent Ontario election was the fact that not only did farm leaders of the highest calibre spring to its support during the campaign but, in spite of a most persistent barrage of falsehood about the CCF taking over farms, etc., and an almost complete pre-election lack of organization, substantial numbers of farmers turned out to vote for the CCF in every part of Ontario. Farmers of Ontario are learning that they can form a most fruitful partnership with organized labor in the CCF to throw off the shackles of their exploiters.

In order to win, the CCF will have to undertake at once the task of effective electoral organization. The battle that is to be waged is for the minds of individual men and women. Democracy involves, amongst other things, crosses on the right number of ballots, and opposite the right names, on

op

gra cap cap Ap

cris

pler

imb

A

tion

uner

such

Inst

grav

Dr.

least

D

a cap

of g

that

fund

funct

robi

imba

separ

comp

prise.

circu

econo

It

in so

taxat

in tw

Is ta

we ar

time

boom

brake

and i

regula

If tax

produ

might

the right day. It has been said that modern warfare requires the highest qualities of initiative and intelligence on the part of every individual soldier. The individual persuading of men and women that it is worth while to bother voting for the CCF candidate on election day can only be done through an informed, enthusiastic canvass by individual members of the CCF, and this cannot be left till election time, or organ-

ized after the writs for election are issued.

Ontario has given Canada a foretaste of the next Dominion election. The CCF had no newspapers for it, and many against it. It had against it a tremendous weight of paid and largely false advertising. It had against it a widespread and very natural distrust of all politics and politicians, and an excusable cynicism. It had against it (in many cases) its own electoral inexperience, and a lack of organization that was almost total in rural constituencies. On its side was a carefully planned campaign, a sound and timely policy, a genuine and tremendous enthusiasm on the part of its volunteer workers.

In the next all-important test, the CCF must add to its assets more complete organization and an even wider participation, in its councils and organization, of people of

goodwill across Canada.

But first and all-important is the will to win, an understanding of the urgency of victory and the fatal consequences of defeat, and of the tremendous amount of hard work, financial sacrifice and sound thinking required.

# Can We Have Full Employment?

E. A. Boder

► AN INTERESTING EVENT at the Couchiching Conference this year was the appearance of Dr. Alvin Hansen. Dr. Hansen is probably the leading liberal economist in the United States. He has been particularly identified with efforts to increase employment even in the pre-war era, and is the author of a plan to provide full employment after the war, which he developed for the National Resources Planning Board. The plan is known as the Compensatory Budget, and is a device whereby the government feeds into the economic stream a volume of capital expenditures designed to offset, or compensate for, a falling off in private investment whenever it appears that such a situation is developing. Capital investment is the heart of the economic system. The government would therefore have two budgets: an ordinary one for the usual expenditures of government, an extraordinary one which would vary with the need of the economy to maintain capital outlay.

The government would also use its taxation powers to curb excessive development of productive capacity when such a curb might appear necessary, and it would, in reverse, cut taxation when it thought that private enterprise needed stimulating. The government would thus attempt to regulate the whole economy, but without interference with private enterprise, in the sense of taking over any of its sectors. On the contrary its task would be to assist business and to step into the capital breach only when private enterprise showed signs of faltering. In substance, this is what Dr. Hansen

proposes.

In the first place it should be noted that if the Compensatory Budget really works, that is, if it can keep the economy on an even keel at relatively full employment, with private enterprise maintaining its ownership of the means of production, then Dr. Hansen will have achieved the philosopher's stone: he will have made capitalism work. The main streets of the capitalist capitals of the world will be named after him, and when he goes to Europe titled ladies will cluster about him for the privilege of kissing his hand. There will be no need for socialist or communist parties, the works of Marx and Engels can be relegated to the ashcan, the struggle between social forces as expressed in their political programs would disappear. Any government could govern; that is, any Tom, Dick or Harry could be the head of the government, adopt the Compensatory Budget and have things tick along nicely.

Fortunately or unfortunately, you have your choice. The soapbox need not yet be removed from circulation, the library shelves need not be emptied, and critics of private enterprise can keep on with their studies of voice production. Dr. Hansen's plan is surprisingly superficial. It makes no attempt at any theoretical exposition or analysis of the capitalist system. It is so hundred per cent. "practical" in all it proposes that any good business man could have produced it. Dr. Hansen sees only the figures and not the law of capitalist production.

At Couchiching, Dr. Hansen instanced the fact that capital expenditures in the United States in 1929 were \$17 bilions, which produced relatively full employment, whereas in 1932 such expenditures were only \$2 billions and we had a great depression. The Compensatory Budget to prevent a similar disaster would pump the missing \$15 billions into the business blood stream.

This is the quintessence of practicality, or the practical man's approach to economics. The reasoning: since 1932 was bad and 1929 was good, and the difference between capital outlays of the two years is \$15 billions, then ergo, the provision of the missing fifteen billions by the government, if no one else will provide it, will do the trick and restor full employment.

Dr. Hansen made no mention of why, things being good in 1929, capital outlay fell so catastrophically to the \$1 billions of 1932. Production was up, employment high, all the conditions that Dr. Hansen or anyone else demands of the economy were fulfilled. What caused the slump? Here unfortunately we have to turn to the realm of theory; the "practical" man cannot supply the answer. It was precisely because capital expenditures were \$17 billions in 1929 that they collapsed to a dismal \$2 billions three years later. What we had here was not an oversight on the part of business or anyone else to make capital expenditures in 1932, but the effects of a law of capitalist production. What is this law? Briefly, it forces capital expenditures at to excessive a rate in the "good" part of the business cycle, so that overproduction with all its ghastly consequences be comes inevitable at a later stage.

This is not a matter of "greed" on the part of capitalists, as some of our moralists explain it; it is an immutable law of competition. Under the compulsion of competitive enterprise there is no way of balancing production and consumption; it must swing too far in one direction and then introduce its own compensatory budget by swinging too far in reverse.

What Dr. Hansen seeks, as I have said, is to make capitalism work, which is only another way of saying that he seeks to eliminate the economic cycle. If the lurches of capitalist production could be straightened out, if an even keel could be maintained, then obviously we could translate our vast productive potential into an era of great common good and plenty. But the economic cycle cannot be eliminated by Dr. Hansen or anyone else so long as the inherent imbalance of capitalist production is permitted to manifest

DYNM

. The

rill be ladies

hand

es, the shean, their

could

e head

t and

. The

n, the

orivate

uction.

kes m

of the

cal" in

e pro-

ne law

at cap-

17 bil-

reas in

had a

vent a

nto the

ractical

32 was

capital

go, the

nment

restore

ng good the \$2

igh, all

ands of

? Here

ry; the

recisely

29 that

s later.

part of

ures in

. What at too

ycle, so ices be

pitalists,

ble law

e enter-

nsump-

n intro-

far in

o make

ing that rches of

an even

ranslate

common

be elim-

inherent manifest itself. That is, so long as private enterprise rules the roost it cannot escape the operation of its own laws. And Dr. Hansen specifically maintains that private enterprise shall operate to its fullest capacity under his plan.

It is not a question of being hostile to Dr. Hansen, of being dogmatic, of conjuring up mythical laws of capitalist production. The economic cycle which Dr. Hansen (and so many others!) seeks to eliminate is as valid as the law of gravity. It is bone, flesh and blood of capitalism and the capitalist era. It first appeared in 1825 (with the rise of capitalist production) and has been with us ever since. Approximately every nine or ten years the same manifestations occur. Fourier characterized the first of them as crise pléthorique, a crisis of superabundance. A crisis of superabundance in 1825! (To most people the idea seemed new in 1930!) Fourier goes on: "In civilization, poverty springs from superabundance itself." We thought we had coined a phrase when we said "poverty in the midst of plenty," but it was already over one hundred years old. Incidentally this is one of the accomplishments of the capitalist system that the proponents of private enterprise never tell us about, yet it is the most important-its recurring

A system of private enterprise can never equate production with purchasing power, hence its cyclic motion and its unemployment. For long years orthodox economists resisted such heresy. They maintained it did equate, which was why they could never explain the cycle; they even refused to acknowledge that there was such a thing. The Brookings Institute, after a four volume study of the last depression, gravely declared that the economy did not seem able to create the requisite purchasing power to buy back the goods produced, hence production and consumption did not equate. Dr. Moulton could probably have found out the same thing if he had stopped the first passerby on the street, but at least it is a worthwhile admission even if it comes late in the day.

Dr. Hansen has nothing to say about this imbalance in a capitalist economy. He seeks only to stimulate it, ignoring its inherent characteristics. He wants, through the medium of government spending, to pump in billions, and believes that is all that needs to be done. But feeding government funds into the economic stream (which would be the main function of the Compensatory Budget) would solve no problem. It would simply increase the area of economic imbalance. The government spending does not go on in a separate economic compartment which somehow miraculously compensates for the inherent disequilibrium of private enterprise. The government funds are fed into the same profit circuit and are subject to the same ills that beset the whole economy.

It will be urged that Dr. Hansen has provided for this in some degree at any rate by reason of his proposal to use taxation as a means of adjustment. This may be considered in two parts. First, what may be called the mechanical side. Is taxation an effective regulator of the economic problems we are discussing? How can taxation be brought to bear in time to produce the necessary braking power to head off the boom phase of the cycle? Who knows at what level the brakes should be applied even if the lag between the tax and its effect did not exist? Moreover, how can taxation tegulate just what has to be regulated and nothing else? If taxation is to be increased to cut down the volume of production and thus counteract the tendency to overproduce, how can it be made to apply precisely to those industries which need such a brake, and not to apply to others which might at the same time need a government shot in the

arm? Although we speak of business cycles, all industries do not simultaneously enjoy boom and depression (especially boom); there is a constant interchange of position as between industries, not to speak of firms within each industry. Taxation is far too blunt an instrument for what is needed here. It is obvious that the economy must be controlled by far more delicate and sensitive mechanisms.

Now let us look at the "practical" side of the taxation proposal. Assume that in Dr. Hansen's opinion it is time to apply the brake, business is becoming too good, it is showing dangerous symptoms of entering the boom area. What does he expect of private industry? That it will renounce expansion? Does he think the president of X Motors will say to his customers that in the interest of the national economy he has decided to refuse further orders for his product? Will private industry welcome taxes at this juncture, even though it is in their own interest that a brake be applied at this time? Imagine the political repercussions of such a proposal, the orations in Congress at the dastard who would nip the high tide of production in the bud! Taxation, particularly for the purpose of preventing the boom phase, is not, in Dr. Hansen's phrase "in the cards."

The decisive factor in eliminating the cycle is not the magnitude of government spending, but control of the productive forces. It is necessary to do what capitalism has never been able to do (at every level of the national income the system has always produced a collapse), and that isto hold production and consumption in balance. This calls for what is virtually a new science. The closest relationship must be established and maintained between every phase of production and all this has to mesh within the field of consumption. This is not an impossible task. Within tolerable limits and after some experience and experiment all this can be accomplished. But it requires the sort of control that is not possible in a system of private enterprise. The state must have the power to plan, and the ownership of the productive forces to carry out the plan. This is a far cry from Dr. Hansen's proposal to leave private enterprise untouched and simply fill in the crevices of the economy by government spending.

The ideal of full employment will remain an ideal for some time to come. This is not to say that governments will not resort to large spending projects as a means of solving the problem that haunts them all. On the contrary, Dr. Hansen will see this part of his plan carried out in many lands, in greater or less degree as the political climate of each country permits. But this government spending in aid of private enterprise will not do the trick. The economic cycle will still shatter the equilibrium of every capitalist state, and we have only a few years to wait to see the truth of this. Moreover, the problem, because of our war-stimulated productive capacity, has reached a new magnitude. Vast government spending is certainly "in the cards"-nowhere in the world can private enterprise now provide full employment-but this entails tremendous loans, all of which can be financed and borne at a high economic level. But if the cycle still operates, then we have a glimpse of the qualitative change that will mark the next depression. It will not be the usual one of "bad times"; it will involve a startling degeneration of the national fabric. In the United States, for example, it could involve a real and serious depreciation of the currency, a flight from money and bonds, a situation almost inconceivable up till now.

Dr. Hansen said he drew up his plan because socialism is not "in the cards." Nevertheless, when the next depression comes around it will be in the political arena that a solution will be sought for the problem of full employment.

n e w N to th

F

## The Unbuttoned Manner

Eleanor Godfrey

"But Forster . . . fears power and suspects formality as the sign of power."\*

▶ WITH AN IRON HAND in a plush glove the nineteenth century tried to squeeze out of man his natural dignities and his natural irreverences. Then, that he might retain a reasonably recognizable shape, it became necessary to starch him. The aristocratic tradition was debased to rules of precedence at dinner-parties, merchants became business men who insured their risks, and a pallid evangelicalism made white ribbons the insignia of social salvation. Most men began to take themselves very, very seriously. They were grave, but not thoughtful, important but not heroic. They were formal. The nineteenth century, in a way, outstripped itself. Men found themselves in control of areas of life and of living long before they had matured to the responsibilities of such power. In a half-hidden fear of the potentialities of what they had discovered they devised a gigantic irrationale of social and moral conventions to curb those more adventurous than themselves and, perhaps, with less to lose.

Like Shaw, but almost a generation younger, E. M. For-ster rebelled against the self-conscious, power-ridden, proprietorial society in which he found himself. But, unlike Shaw, he refused to crusade. In his hypersensitive distaste for formality he could not bring himself to state his protest in terms of great themes, great people. In his opening chapter, Lionel Trilling discusses with delicacy and understanding this refusal of Forster's to be great. He notes that the comic manner as developed in Fielding, Dickens, Meredith and James, becomes in Forster "the unbuttoned manner." Almost all his characters trip at one time or another into the absurd. They are almost too human. The trivial and the casual will be permitted to distract them directly the profound or the tragic looms. At times this facetiousness is so pronounced that it destroys Forster's meaning entirely and leaves the reader with the same uneasy disappointment as with food tasted in a dream. But when he is truly effective, when he catches "the relaxed will," he gives his characters and their conflicts a reality and even a nobility unsurpassed in modern English novel writing. But it is for these reasons, Trilling believes, that Forster is scarcely appreciated in America and only well known to a small circle in England. Forster's preoccupation with "the relaxed will," by which he means catching people when they are not looking, makes him choose the apparently incidental for his material and the apparently aimless for his characters. But this superficial tenuousness is an important, even necessary, part of what Forster has to say.

Like Hawthorne and Henry James, although, Trilling feels, in a smaller way, Forster's theme is "the inextricable tangle of good and evil and . . . how perilous moral action can be." Time and again the highest motives are shown to be adulterated with concern for class, for pride, for money, for race, for the intangible egotism of human nature. Some of these Forster derides, of course, but on the whole he doesn't demand of men and women that they should cure themselves of these weaknesses but rather that they should always bear in mind how likely they are to corrupt the solution of their problems. He is continually warning his characters to be on

guard against the unperceived bigotries of their upbringing. It is only when you are natural with one another, only when you meet with relaxed wills, he seems to say, that you are safe. In the juxtaposition of his characters Forster is most skilful in bringing this out. He likes to pose his middle class English people against people of more elemental back. ground. In Where Angels Fear to Tread a young English woman marries an Italian dentist in Italy. In A Passage to India English men and women find their lives suddenly and frighteningly enmeshed with those of Hindus and Mohammedans. Or Forster will involve his middle-class men and women with others on a higher or a lower level as in Howard's End. In A Room With a View he combines the two devices by having his heroine fall in love with a socially unacceptable young Englishman while she is touring Italy. In each instance the English middle-class is shown to be dangerously and ridiculously inflexible and what happiness is to be won by its members is only won by a relaxing of the will. But Forster does not leave the issue so clearly cut and exposed. He goes on to prove that his more natural and elemental characters are not good, only a little better. The Italian is a bully, the Mohammedan vain and shallow. the lower-class young man a neurotic. It is on this point that Lionel Trilling is most illuminating.

"For all his long commitment to the doctrines of liberalism, Forster is at war with the liberal imagination." Forster, according to Trilling, believes there are no absolutes in human affairs. He distrusts the great simplicities. Liberalism, at least as preached over the last half century, has always used a vocabulary of absolutes and ideals. It is frequently shocked into withdrawal by the contradictions implicit in mankind's untidy heritage of good-and-evil. Forster has little patience with this liberal timidity. An imagination blind to the significance of Adam's fall is, he insists, an imagination incapable of embracing the behavior of men and women. Nevertheless Forster's trick of building up characters and situations only to tear them down often seems irritatingly perverse. Trilling believes this technique is necessary to what Forster wants to say, but even the reader whose sensibilities are most exactly tuned must frequently feel that Forster unnecessarily sacrifices his story and his dramatic values to his conviction that man is neither a sheep nor a goat but a fallen angel.

Trilling is very tolerant of Forster's use of sudden death and coincidence to smooth the paths of his plots. But this easy-going disregard for artistic proportion seriously weakens his novels. In The Longest Journey Gerald's death in a football game is a startling but successful use of the device; in later novels such sudden deaths seemed to be irresponsible short-cuts to the dénouement, rather than an integral part of the action. Trilling, too, is much too understanding and forgiving about Miss Bartlett's sudden reversal of feeling at the end of A Room With a View. He accepts it as just another example of Forster's feeling for the incalculable in human nature. Of course, the change of feeling does enable the hero and heroine to become reconciled, but one cannot escape the suspicion that Forster was too indolent to work out a more convincing situation. *Howard's End*, with its careful dovetailing of action and meaning, of people and place, is Forster's best novel because he expended as much care on its construction as he did on its personalities. A Passage to India would be equally as good, were it not for the inconclusiveness of the final chapters.

In E. M. Forster Lionel Trilling has made a contribution to critical writing which is a truly important event in letters. After years of literature discussed in terms of political and

\*E. M. FORSTER: Lionel Trilling; New Directions; pp. 192; \$1.50.

October, 1943

rum

ging. only

t you

ter is

back-

nglish

ige to

y and

and

as in

s the

cially

Italy.

to be

oines

ng of

y cut

atural

etter.

allow,

point

beral-

erster,

es in

beral-

, has It is

ctions

l-evil.

. An is, he

avior

ilding

often

nique

eader

ently

d his

sheep

death

t this

akens

foot-

ce; in

nsible

part

g and

eeling

s just

ble in

nable

annot

work

th its

and

much s. A ot for

ution

tters.

social theories, to find a writer evaluating a novelist by the canons of his own field of art is exciting and heartening.

As companion pieces to this study, reprints of *The Longest Journeyt* and of *A Room With a Viewt* have been issued by the publishers. They are excellently produced and inexpensive volumes and I hope it is safe to presume that the rest of Forster's works will appear under the same imprint.

#### Fall Thoughts

Now let Fall make the horizon narrow, reduce the earth's circumference to an accepted thing—easy chairs drawn close and set within a ring where the thin pointed flame shoots like an upward arrow. Now let Fall make of the earth a burrow, turn men to moles, forcing them to bring the overcrowded length of the Fall evening to bear upon the summer-spurned face of their sorrow.

For winds of October allow no compromise, no sudden sweet soaring of the befriended heart, no tracing of the finger along the earth's rim; allow instead, eyes' swift avoidance of eyes, a period when man must set himself apart to retain for himself a small portion of him.

P. K. Page.

#### Ode: The Eumenides

If we could go again to the innocent wood Where the crisp floor muffles the tread And the classic shade of cedar and pine Soothes the depraved head In the children's glen, It might be that the casual dead In their stained shrouds Would not find us there.

These times indeed Breed anguish.

Betrayed by the bold front and the bright line How shall we return to the significant dark Of piety and fear Where Holiness smoothed our hair And Honor kissed us goodbye?

Where foreheads bleed The cry is blood!

We have a date in another wood,
In the stifling dark, where the Furies are:
The unravelled implacable host
With accurate eyes levelled
Wait in the enchanted shade—
Where we spilled our bloodshot seed
They wait, each patient ghost
My ruined son.

The Furies lift the veil—
I know that face!

A. J. M. Smith.

†THE LONGEST JOURNEY: E. M. Forster; New Classics-New Directions; \$1.00.

#### Mutable Hearts

Now with a rush the children of men tackle the windswirled slope,
their olive shirts windplastered to their ribs their cries flashing under the throstled sky, to meet the autumn.

Is it so swift out of mind—
the brambled valley of summer
that shivers yet in its thin ornaments
left desolate, now,
till from late silken threads of light
invisibility be spun complete?

The counterpoint is shabby that cannot suffer its own ridicule.

Motionless, in the seamurmurous dark room she sits intent to focus with her stricken wisdom the corded truth about the son from whom so long she beat away the leaden angels—indomitable, lifting her knuckled forehead to the indifferent sea-salt of the dark.

Out of that locus though, the boy
is fleet: perhaps gone forth
not on the windy sea, but down a street
to spit on the warm sawdust in the fish store,
or on the mealy cone-strewn forest earth
to skewer, cinnamon-strong;
and many a crooked way
till amidst vasty snowfields
the purple shadows shoulder him,
and out of the bright-needled winter wilds

to find her gazing out
with wilful wisdom, in her cheated pride;
to dabble with her dream
that sin is in his flickering, and the sun
and seasons.

he returns home:

What is the drag against the current?

Why does the look of god shine still
above the rushy pool
while cold swords wait beyond the sweeping curve
of the dark river?

On the blown ridge now tilt the children of men
borne in the breathy brown frost-foaming air.

Margaret Avison.



<sup>‡</sup>A ROOM WITH A VIEW: E. M. Forster; New Classics-New Directions; \$1.00.

# STOP P-U-R-R-I-N-G

# THE WAR ISN'T

Sure, we're doing well...but it isn't over, and we can't afford to relax our efforts as long as there is a single one of our men within range of enemy fire, nor as long as the Axis has any fighting ability left.

We can hasten victory. We can speed the end of the war. We can get our men back home, victorious, a good deal sooner, if we do our part without slackening, without complacency.

And we can quicken the coming of peace and happiness in which our wartime thrift will be rewarded. The Victory Bonds we have bought during the war will be our keys to opportunity, and to the enjoyment of new things when the war is won.

The Fifth Victory Loan will start October 18th. Lend your savings to your country—and plan to lend more out of income.

Every dollar you put into these bonds is still your dollar, earning good interest, growing into a nest-egg that ensures your future. You are not giving ... you are LENDING, and what you lend is helping to shorten the war, to hasten the happy days.

# GET READY TO BUY MORE VICTORY BONDS



Octo

dem all o

taxa expe (\$5,

Fina Leas prob

solve

are i

enter

priva

a be

Re

425,0

mant

25,00

24,90

fellov

I hav

25,00 man

dustr

atten

treati

the s

comn

the re

the e

descr

a few

what

a few

popul

plann

Econo

in wh

organ

the fo

Let

refer

not, c

which

are co

cratic

is any

domes

at the

maint

from '

all inv

prices

would

Scott

any re

indust

other's

done

repres

recent

"gove

Let

Ic

# PLANNING POST-WAR CANADA

A Special Section of THE CANADIAN FORUM

October, 1943

## Mr. Macdonnell Replies to His Critics

▶ IN THE AUGUST CANADIAN FORUM I wrote on "The Case for Individual Enterprise" and Mr. Scott replied. In the September number Mr. Hankin commented on what both of us had written and Mr. Scott made further comment on Mr. Hankin. It is now my turn to reply.

Mr. Scott and I are far apart and indeed we seem like parallel lines which never meet. I prefer, however, in the space available not to seek to attack him all along the line but to single out a few points which seem to me most important

Incidentally let me say that there is this great satisfaction in carrying on a controversy with Mr. Scott—that you know where you are. He is an out-and-out socialist and does not pretend to be anything else. Some of his CCF colleagues, notably Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Jolliffe, seem at times to be greatly concerned to disguise their Socialism. But then, of course, they have to consider votes.

In the first place, a few words as to some of Mr. Scott's statements of fact.

(1) Mr. Scott says: "The agricultural industry in Canada kept its price of farm machinery almost level when the price of wheat had dropped to rock bottom; result, more income to the industry but unemployment among its workers and no machinery on the farms."

The facts are as follows: It is true that prices of machinery dropped little, if any. It is not true that there was "more income to the industry." On the contrary there was greatly decreased income. In fact the Massey-Harris Company, the largest company in the industry in Canada, suffered losses (including necessary write-downs and readjustments) each year from 1930 to 1936 totalling in all over \$22,000,000, and no dividends whatever were paid to any class of its shareholders for eleven years from 1931 to 1941.

- (2) Mr. Scott, in criticizing the price charged by the Aluminium Company, says: "Meanwhile [he is referring to the period since 1931] the cost of making aluminum has fallen greatly, particularly in Canada." Aluminium Limited, the Canadian Company, itself states that the costs of producing crude aluminum today are about 30 per cent. higher than in 1931 and about 85 per cent. higher than in 1939. This is due largely to increased costs of ocean freights and of labor.
- (3) Mr. Scott says: "How . . . justify giving the Bell Telephone Company a monopoly position which removes risk and allowing it a cool 8% when the little buyer of War Bonds gets 3%?" Mr. Hankin has already pointed out that "Mr. Scott is wrong . . . in conveying the impression that the investor in Bell Telephone shares enjoys a return of 8%. Actually this figure represents a return of about 5% on the real investment." I should like to add that there is nothing sacrosanct about the 8%—in 1935 and 1936 it was 6%, and in 1937 7%. The average yield from 1935 to 1942, taking into account average prices of the stock during the same period, has been 4.92%. Having in mind what Mr.

Hankin points out, that the business is subject to substantial risks from new investment, I doubt if anyone will regard this as an undue return. Certainly it is a very different story from the 8% which Mr. Scott mentions.

I have taken pains to get the truth on these matters and believe I have succeeded. If so, I can only say that these misstatements of Mr. Scott are most unfortunate and to much harm by clouding the issue. I feel it is a great pit that on such vital matters where there is room for wite difference of opinion among honest and fair-minded men, even when all the facts are agreed on, the difficulties of reaching a common ground, which ought to be the aim of us all, should be so vastly increased by misstatements such

In this article, Mr. Macdonnell replies to the criticisms of his statement, "The Case for Individual Enterprise," made by Mr. F. R. Scott and Mr. Francis Hankin. His reply to Mr. Eugene Forsey will appear in this section next month.

as these. I dislike saying this, particularly in view of Mr. Scott's kindly exempting me from some of his criticisms, but I think the matter is too important to refrain from expressing my true feelings.

Moreover, I wonder whether it is his readiness to believe evil of men which produces a state of mind which permits Mr. Scott to talk of those who differ from him on these questions as if they were actuated by nothing but ruthless selfishness-indeed as if they were in effect public enemies. The truth is that these men whom he criticizes (I am thinking particularly at the moment of those engaged in production) are just like other members of the community except that they have on the whole more energy, more courage, more resourcefulness and more initiative. These qualities do, of course, go along sometimes with a certain ruthlessness and high-handedness, but to leave the impression, as he does, that these men are cold, calculating, ruthless, unsympathetic, is about as fair as it would be to say that every labor leader is a racketeer. Further, to suggest that the increasing sense of social responsibility which business feels is nothing but fear for possessions-well, I doubt if fair-minded people will believe that.

I come now to Mr. Scott's suggestion that the war has fully solved the problem of employment and in so doing it has proved that private enterprise is a positive obstacle to progress. Here are his words: "Then came the war and the introduction of some degree of social planning which has incontestably proved that so soon as we abandon capitalis methods we became vastly more efficient. The national income is now three times as large as ten years ago. Instead of unemployment we have a shortage of labor . . . How is this possible? Because public enterprise, called 'the war effort,' has invaded certain fields formerly left to private enterprise."

This is a very simple explanation of our present state of full employment. Many people have thought it was more largely due to other things. First of all, instead of markets hermetically sealed against us we have had the insatiable

tial

ard

ory

hese

pity vide nen, of

d

e

Mr.

mits hese aless

nies.

duc-

cept

age, do, ness loes,

etic,

ader

ense

but

wil

g it e to

the

alist

onal

tead

w is

war

vate

e of

nore

kets

demands of war suddenly giving us a market for nearly all our products. Next, by tremendous efforts (and of course assisted by increased production) we have stepped up our taxation and borrowing till in the current fiscal year we expect to raise nearly eleven times our pre-war budget (\$5,500,000,000 as against something over \$500,000,000). Finally, raw materials have been made available through Lease-Lend and other pooling arrangements, so that our problems of obtaining essential raw materials have been solved. But apparently in Mr. Scott's mind these things are merely incidential. To him it was all "because public enterprise." Surely the socialist case is capable of a better statement than this.

Referring to my statement that there are more than "25,000 separate organizations in Canada in the field of manufacturing alone," Mr. Scott says: "His figures of the 15,000 separate organizations mean almost nothing since 24,900 of these are dominated at every turn by the big fellows." This statement is almost as unwarranted as those I have previously quoted and commented on. Why not say 15,000 are dominated and have done with it? No sensible man will deny that the problem of domination of one industry by another is a real one which should engage the attention of serious men. I do not feel that Mr. Scott is treating the matter seriously, and as Mr. Forsey has asked the same question in a serious manner I shall reserve my comments for him.

I come now to one statement of Mr. Scott which goes to the root of the whole matter and with which I wish to deal particularly. In my remarks I said: "Let us be clear as to the exact meaning of the Fully Planned Economy. Let us describe it in plain, intelligible words. It means this: that a few persons assume to have a superhuman wisdom to decide what the rest of us are to produce and consume—it means a few individuals who plan and give orders and a whole population who obey." Commenting on my statement that planning by the few is contemplated in the Fully Planned Economy, Mr. Scott says: "In that case I reject the Fully Planned Economy. The planning I contemplate is a planning in which the people as a whole through their democratic organizations play the leading part. Planning by the few for the few is what we have under monopoly capitalism. We have too much of it already."

Let us try to come to grips on this crucial point. When I refer to "a few individuals who plan and give orders" I do not, of course, deny that there will be many minor things which can be democratically done. Even in Russia there are certain minor matters dealt with by apparently democratic methods, but I think no one will suggest that there is anything democratic about the major decisions in Russia.

Let us make this point practical by applying it to our domestic situation at the moment. If Mr. Scott has his way, at the end of the war the controls presently existing will be maintained and no doubt extended. It is abundantly clear from what he says that he would for example desire (1) that all investments should be controlled by the state; (2) that prices should be set by law; (3) that imports and exports would be possible only under government license. Does Mr. Scott think that these things can be democratically done in any real sense? Does he picture a meeting of farmers and industrial workers democratically fixing the prices of each other's products? He will reply, no doubt, that it will be done democratically in the sense that it is done by elected representatives. He must know, however, as pointed out recently in a series of two-minute talks on socialism, that "governments must be autocratic in carrying on the day-

#### SEEMS LOGICAL — TO NEW ZEALAND!

We bave built in New Zealand, alongside our fighting policy — our war policy — a social security system. The idea behind the social security system is that in so far as a person is unable to care for himself or berself then it is a collective responsibility to see that those things necessary for physical welfare and cultural life are made available to them; and we have expressed it in words of this type: that the first charge on all the wealth created should be the care of the aged, the care of the young, the care of the invalid; and of those engaged in the production of essential utilities. The aged, because of the fact that the standards we enjoy today, would not bave been possible bad it not been for the work they have done in past years. For the young, because we must provide for the future. We must see that the environment and the influences which mould the character of those who are now growing up are such that they will be able with the knowledge and experience they acquire to make a better world than the world they inherited. For the ailing, because they cannot provide for themselves; and ordinary buman decency demands that they should share along with ourselves and others the good things that are available. That is the simple philosophy that is behind the war policy of the government in New Zealand.

Hon. Walter Nash, addressing the House of Commons Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment, 1942 (Proceedings, p. 82).

to-day matters which they deal with" and that if government operates our economic life instead of regulating it then our economic life will be autocratically controlled. Our safeguard at present is that the great bulk of the economic life of the state is carried on by individuals operating under regulation and control. Under Socialism this will be changed. Power will be taken away from those who exercise it now under control (which control may be as wide as public opinion demands) and power will be given to men who will exercise it with no real control of any kind.

How do Mr. Scott and his confreres escape these conclusions? The truth seems to be that socialists succeed in making themselves believe that power in their hands will be different from power in the hands of others. In answer to the argument that major decisions must be made by a few men, one of the socialist leaders used to me not long ago words to this effect: "We think that in our party the rank and file will be so close to the leaders that there will really be no occasion for the exercise of authority." I mentioned this to a former Minister of the Crown. His reply was, with a metaphoric wringing of the hands, "Will people not realize that governments must govern?"

Mr. Scott says that we have too much planning by the few under monopoly capitalism. While I do not admit this but on the contrary repeat that we have planning now by the many, nevertheless even if it were true, planning under the non-Socialist state is always subject to review by the will of the people as expressed in government, whereas I repeat that under Mr. Scott's plan there will be no review. There will be no one to control the controllers.

Thus by a different route we find ironically enough that Socialism by undertaking to plan fully our economy will

Oct

itse

it c

Har

oper

bein

prod

man

capi

capi

App

crise

supe

new

sprir

coine

plent

Incid

alist

tell

imba

tion

unen

such

they

ackn

Insti

grave

creat

prod Dr.

if he

least

the c

Di

a cap

its ir

of go

that

fund:

funct

probl

imba

separ

comp

prise.

circu

econo

in so

taxat

in tw

Is ta

we as

time

boom

brake

and i

regula

If ta

produ

which

might

It

It

have inevitably to exercise the same controls as in the Fascist states. They will find, even the benevolent and well-meaning ones, that power in their hands will have to be exercised as absolute power always is exercised. Incidentally that will mean that the benevolent and well-meaning ones will be ousted by those in their ranks who understand what power really does mean. I don't doubt there are such, though they may not be the present leaders.

That socialism will have the results which I have described would appear to be fully acknowledged by such people as Mrs. Webb, G. D. H. Cole (Mr. Forsey adds Harold Laski) and certainly by Bernard Shaw, who scoffs at the idea that Parliament could ever run a socialist state. These authorities are apparently so obsessed by the prospects of the material good which they think socialism will bring that they are ready to forgo the things for which we are commonly supposed to be fighting. Is Mr. Scott ready to forego these things too or does he, like Mr. Forsey, think that these leading socialists are wrong in their political views?

One further point. Mr. Scott knows much better than I that in advocating socialism he is not advocating anything new. He is aware that the regimented state has been tried before, with the results which I have outlined. Does he think, with the example of the totalitarian states before him, that in the 20th Century regimentation will produce different results from those in the past?

To sum up. We are being asked to abandon the great Anglo-Saxon discovery that political and social stability depends on a distribution of power. Socialists propose that economic power, which plays such an important part in the lives of all of us and which is at present distributed between private enterprise and government, should be concentrated in the hands of government. They thus clearly propose to destroy economic liberty in the sense in which it is defined by Professor Ernest Barker as "a power of original action or, in other words, self-determination resident in the individual and relative to the area of economic activity."

Why should we follow this extreme course when there is a middle road, namely, the combination of state and private enterprise? Mr. Churchill has pointed the way. What we need, he says, is "that state enterprise and free enterprise both serve national interests and pull the national wagon side by side." Mr. Churchill has also given us a significant warning of what happens if we take the other course. "We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privilege."

I must deal briefly with Mr. Hankin's comments.

Mr. Hankin may be quite right in saying that I do not "emphasize sufficiently the conditions under which the freedom it [private enterprise] enjoys may be permitted to continue." Nevertheless I can assure him that I myself and those who share my views will agree that there must be more "disciplines" of business, to use his word, than before the war.

Without committing myself to all that he says about control I would go a long way with him. One particular reservation I would make on the matter of state control of investments. I would hope that there might be guidance and a readiness of government to step into the field of investment in case of emergency, but that we might be spared the rigidity of actual control. The Lever memorandum and other similar memoranda suggest a method by which government may play this role, which one may describe as a "pinchhitter" investor.

#### BUT THEY DO NOT PLAN!

Mr. Castleden: Should we not have some kind of planning board which will first of all look into the social needs of our own people, the sort of things you have been outlining to us, that will provide work for all, and give help to all?

Dr. Cyril James: I have a boly fear of setting up new boards, and particularly of anything as comprehensive as a planning board. After all, reconstruction affects every detail of Canadian life. It affects every individual man, woman and child from the time they go to school to the time when they retire on pension, or eventually die. It affects every part of our industry and agriculture. If you set up a planning board, its jurisdiction would be co-extensive with that of the cabinet and parliament. . . . My own feeling is that the cabinet itself and parliament, as they are now constituted, constitute a planning board.

Proceedings of the House of Commons Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment, 1942, p. 73.

I subscribe fully to what Mr. Hankin says about the pressure of conflicting groups if our present system is replaced by socialism, where government instead of being the regulator, the referee, the guide becomes itself the active operator. We have pressure groups now of course, but nevertheless much is decided by the action and inter-action of economic forces. Under socialism everything would be done by pressure groups seeking to get the ear of those exercising the supreme authority.

Mr. Hankin, while anxious, like myself, that personal liberty should be "invaded as little as possible," seems to suggest that the choice is between "liberty" on the one hand and "efficiency and equity" on the other hand. I cannot quite believe that Mr. Hankin wishes to suggest this alternative and in particular to suggest that there is more efficiency under government operation in the sense that production of goods for the community would be greater. However freely we admit the need of controls and regulations for private enterprise, I do not believe that it can be seriously doubted that so far as actual productive effort is concerned our experience to date shows that it will be greater under private enterprise. I think myself that if we assess the situation realistically we find it hard to escape this conclusion. Leaving out the exceptional men, for example many of our senior civil servants, there is a disposition among those in government employ to feel that something less than an all-out effort will get by. Take for example the simple matter of economy. It is hard for the ordinary man in the government service to resist the feeling that there is no limit to the amount of money available through taxation, that there is no danger of his job coming to an end because it is too expensive to

Let me take a rather simple illustration of which I have some personal knowledge. I think anyone who has served in the army, which after all is the greatest socialist enterprise we have ever had (I am referring to the army entirely on its business side and not on its battle side), will admit that on its business side it falls far short of the business efficiency of private enterprise. I defy anyone with army experience to deny this, and while I do not press the illustration unduly, nevertheless I think anyone who knows the Army will recognize that there is not and can hardly be the same sense of day to day urgency as in ordinary civilian like.

the

re-

the

tive

ver-

1 of

one

sing

onal

s to

and

nnot

rna-

ency

n of

eely

vate bted

es-

vate

tion

eav-

nior

ern-

ffort

my.

vice

it of

nger

e to

have

rved

nter-

irely

dmit

ness

rmy

stra

the

the

life.

itself. That is, so long as private enterprise rules the roost it cannot escape the operation of its own laws. And Dr. Hansen specifically maintains that private enterprise shall operate to its fullest capacity under his plan.

It is not a question of being hostile to Dr. Hansen, of being dogmatic, of conjuring up mythical laws of capitalist production. The economic cycle which Dr. Hansen (and so many others!) seeks to eliminate is as valid as the law of gravity. It is bone, flesh and blood of capitalism and the capitalist era. It first appeared in 1825 (with the rise of capitalist production) and has been with us ever since. Approximately every nine or ten years the same manifest-ations occur. Fourier characterized the first of them as crise pléthorique, a crisis of superabundance. A crisis of superabundance in 1825! (To most people the idea seemed new in 1930!) Fourier goes on: "In civilization, poverty springs from superabundance itself." We thought we had coined a phrase when we said "poverty in the midst of plenty," but it was already over one hundred years old. Incidentally this is one of the accomplishments of the capitalist system that the proponents of private enterprise never tell us about, yet it is the most important-its recurring imbalance.

A system of private enterprise can never equate production with purchasing power, hence its cyclic motion and its unemployment. For long years orthodox economists resisted such heresy. They maintained it did equate, which was why they could never explain the cycle; they even refused to acknowledge that there was such a thing. The Brookings Institute, after a four volume study of the last depression, gravely declared that the economy did not seem able to create the requisite purchasing power to buy back the goods produced, hence production and consumption did not equate. Dr. Moulton could probably have found out the same thing if he had stopped the first passerby on the street, but at least it is a worthwhile admission even if it comes late in the day.

Dr. Hansen has nothing to say about this imbalance in a capitalist economy. He seeks only to stimulate it, ignoring its inherent characteristics. He wants, through the medium of government spending, to pump in billions, and believes that is all that needs to be done. But feeding government funds into the economic stream (which would be the main function of the Compensatory Budget) would solve no problem. It would simply increase the area of economic imbalance. The government spending does not go on in a separate economic compartment which somehow miraculously compensates for the inherent disequilibrium of private enterprise. The government funds are fed into the same profit circuit and are subject to the same ills that beset the whole economy.

It will be urged that Dr. Hansen has provided for this in some degree at any rate by reason of his proposal to use taxation as a means of adjustment. This may be considered in two parts. First, what may be called the mechanical side. Is taxation an effective regulator of the economic problems we are discussing? How can taxation be brought to bear in time to produce the necessary braking power to head off the boom phase of the cycle? Who knows at what level the brakes should be applied even if the lag between the tax and its effect did not exist? Moreover, how can taxation regulate just what has to be regulated and nothing else? If taxation is to be increased to cut down the volume of production and thus counteract the tendency to overproduce, how can it be made to apply precisely to those industries which need such a brake, and not to apply to others which might at the same time need a government shot in the

arm? Although we speak of business cycles, all industries do not simultaneously enjoy boom and depression (especially boom); there is a constant interchange of position as between industries, not to speak of firms within each industry. Taxation is far too blunt an instrument for what is needed here. It is obvious that the economy must be controlled by far more delicate and sensitive mechanisms.

Now let us look at the "practical" side of the taxation proposal. Assume that in Dr. Hansen's opinion it is time to apply the brake, business is becoming too good, it is showing dangerous symptoms of entering the boom area. What does he expect of private industry? That it will renounce expansion? Does he think the president of X Motors will say to his customers that in the interest of the national economy he has decided to refuse further orders for his product? Will private industry welcome taxes at this juncture, even though it is in their own interest that a brake be applied at this time? Imagine the political repercussions of such a proposal, the orations in Congress at the dastard who would nip the high tide of production in the bud! Taxation, particularly for the purpose of preventing the boom phase, is not, in Dr. Hansen's phrase "in the cards."

The decisive factor in eliminating the cycle is not the magnitude of government spending, but control of the productive forces. It is necessary to do what capitalism has never been able to do (at every level of the national income the system has always produced a collapse), and that isto hold production and consumption in balance. This calls for what is virtually a new science. The closest relationship must be established and maintained between every phase of production and all this has to mesh within the field of consumption. This is not an impossible task. Within tolerable limits and after some experience and experiment all this can be accomplished. But it requires the sort of control that is not possible in a system of private enterprise. The state must have the power to plan, and the ownership of the productive forces to carry out the plan. This is a far cry from Dr. Hansen's proposal to leave private enterprise untouched and simply fill in the crevices of the economy by government spending.

The ideal of full employment will remain an ideal for some time to come. This is not to say that governments will not resort to large spending projects as a means of solving the problem that haunts them all. On the contrary, Dr. Hansen will see this part of his plan carried out in many lands, in greater or less degree as the political climate of each country permits. But this government spending in aid of private enterprise will not do the trick. The economic cycle will still shatter the equilibrium of every capitalist state, and we have only a few years to wait to see the truth of this. Moreover, the problem, because of our war-stimulated productive capacity, has reached a new magnitude. Vast government spending is certainly "in the cards"-nowhere in the world can private enterprise now provide full employment-but this entails tremendous loans, all of which can be financed and borne at a high economic level. But if the cycle still operates, then we have a glimpse of the qualitative change that will mark the next depression. It will not be the usual one of "bad times"; it will involve a startling degeneration of the national fabric. In the United States, for example, it could involve a real and serious depreciation of the currency, a flight from money and bonds, a situation almost inconceivable up till now.

Dr. Hansen said he drew up his plan because socialism is not "in the cards." Nevertheless, when the next depression comes around it will be in the political arena that a solution will be sought for the problem of full employment.

Jo the siv

red

eas who No

tur

the

to l

For

DO S

no i

THE

A RO

Di

#### The Unbuttoned Manner

Eleanor Godfrey

"But Forster . . . fears power and suspects formality as the sign of power."\*

▶ WITH AN IRON HAND in a plush glove the nineteenth century tried to squeeze out of man his natural dignities and his natural irreverences. Then, that he might retain a reasonably recognizable shape, it became necessary to starch him. The aristocratic tradition was debased to rules of precedence at dinner-parties, merchants became business men who insured their risks, and a pallid evangelicalism made white ribbons the insignia of social salvation. Most men began to take themselves very, very seriously. They were grave, but not thoughtful, important but not heroic. They were formal. The nineteenth century, in a way, outstripped itself. Men found themselves in control of areas of life and of living long before they had matured to the responsibilities of such power. In a half-hidden fear of the potentialities of what they had discovered they devised a gigantic irrationale of social and moral conventions to curb those more adventurous than themselves and, perhaps, with less to lose.

Like Shaw, but almost a generation younger, E. M. Forster rebelled against the self-conscious, power-ridden, proprietorial society in which he found himself. But, unlike Shaw, he refused to crusade. In his hypersensitive distaste for formality he could not bring himself to state his protest in terms of great themes, great people. In his opening chapter, Lionel Trilling discusses with delicacy and understanding this refusal of Forster's to be great. He notes that the comic manner as developed in Fielding, Dickens, Meredith and James, becomes in Forster "the unbuttoned manner." Almost all his characters trip at one time or another into the absurd. They are almost too human. The trivial and the casual will be permitted to distract them directly the profound or the tragic looms. At times this facetiousness is so pronounced that it destroys Forster's meaning entirely and leaves the reader with the same uneasy disappointment as with food tasted in a dream. But when he is truly effective, when he catches "the relaxed will," he gives his characters and their conflicts a reality and even a nobility unsurpassed in modern English novel writing. But it is for these reasons, Trilling believes, that Forster is scarcely appreciated in America and only well known to a small circle in England. Forster's preoccupation with "the relaxed will," by which he means catching people when they are not looking, makes him choose the apparently incidental for his material and the apparently aimless for his characters. But this superficial tenuousness is an important, even necessary, part of what Forster has to say.

Like Hawthorne and Henry James, although, Trilling feels, in a smaller way, Forster's theme is "the inextricable tangle of good and evil and . . . how perilous moral action can be." Time and again the highest motives are shown to be adulterated with concern for class, for pride, for money, for race, for the intangible egotism of human nature. Some of these Forster derides, of course, but on the whole he doesn't demand of men and women that they should cure themselves of these weaknesses but rather that they should always bear in mind how likely they are to corrupt the solution of their problems. He is continually warning his characters to be on

guard against the unperceived bigotries of their upbringing It is only when you are natural with one another, only when you meet with relaxed wills, he seems to say, that you are safe. In the juxtaposition of his characters Forster is most skilful in bringing this out. He likes to pose his middle class English people against people of more elemental back-ground. In Where Angels Fear to Tread a young English woman marries an Italian dentist in Italy. In A Passage to India English men and women find their lives suddenly and frighteningly enmeshed with those of Hindus and Mohammedans. Or Forster will involve his middle-class men and women with others on a higher or a lower level as in Howard's End. In A Room With a View he combines the two devices by having his heroine fall in love with a socially unacceptable young Englishman while she is touring Italy. In each instance the English middle-class is shown to be dangerously and ridiculously inflexible and what happiness is to be won by its members is only won by a relaxing of the will. But Forster does not leave the issue so clearly cut and exposed. He goes on to prove that his more natural and elemental characters are not good, only a little better. The Italian is a bully, the Mohammedan vain and shallow. the lower-class young man a neurotic. It is on this point that Lionel Trilling is most illuminating.

"For all his long commitment to the doctrines of liberalism, Forster is at war with the liberal imagination." Forster, according to Trilling, believes there are no absolutes in human affairs. He distrusts the great simplicities. Liberalism, at least as preached over the last half century, has always used a vocabulary of absolutes and ideals. It is frequently shocked into withdrawal by the contradictions implicit in mankind's untidy heritage of good-and-evil. Forster has little patience with this liberal timidity. An imagination blind to the significance of Adam's fall is, he insists, an imagination incapable of embracing the behavior of men and women. Nevertheless Forster's trick of building up characters and situations only to tear them down often seems irritatingly perverse. Trilling believes this technique is necessary to what Forster wants to say, but even the reader whose sensibilities are most exactly tuned must frequently feel that Forster unnecessarily sacrifices his story and his dramatic values to his conviction that man is neither a sheep nor a goat but a fallen angel.

Trilling is very tolerant of Forster's use of sudden death and coincidence to smooth the paths of his plots. But this easy-going disregard for artistic proportion seriously weakers his novels. In The Longest Journey Gerald's death in a football game is a startling but successful use of the device; in later novels such sudden deaths seemed to be irresponsible short-cuts to the dénouement, rather than an integral par of the action. Trilling, too, is much too understanding and forgiving about Miss Bartlett's sudden reversal of feeling at the end of A Room With a View. He accepts it as just another example of Forster's feeling for the incalculable in human nature. Of course, the change of feeling does enable the hero and heroine to become reconciled, but one cannot escape the suspicion that Forster was too indolent to work out a more convincing situation. Howard's End, with its careful dovetailing of action and meaning, of people and place, is Forster's best novel because he expended as much care on its construction as he did on its personalities. A Passage to India would be equally as good, were it not for the inconclusiveness of the final chapters.

In E. M. Forster Lionel Trilling has made a contribution to critical writing which is a truly important event in letters. After years of literature discussed in terms of political and

<sup>\*</sup>E. M. FORSTER: Lionel Trilling; New Directions; pp. 192; \$1.50.

rum

ging. only

you

ter is ddleback-

nglish

ge to

ham-

and

as in

cially

Italy.

to be

pines

ng of

y cut

atural

etter.

allow,

point

beral-

orster,

tes in

beral-

, has

ctions

d-evil.

. An

is, he

havior

ilding

often

nique

reader

uently

nd his

sheep

death

at this

eakens

a foot-

ice; in

nsibk

l part

g and

feeling

as just

ble in

enable

cannot

work

ith its

le and

much

ies. A

bution

etters

al and

social theories, to find a writer evaluating a novelist by the canons of his own field of art is exciting and heartening.

As companion pieces to this study, reprints of *The Longest Journey†* and of *A Room With a View‡* have been issued by the publishers. They are excellently produced and inexpensive volumes and I hope it is safe to presume that the rest of Forster's works will appear under the same imprint.

#### Fall Jhoughts

Now let Fall make the horizon narrow, reduce the earth's circumference to an accepted thing—easy chairs drawn close and set within a ring where the thin pointed flame shoots like an upward arrow. Now let Fall make of the earth a burrow, turn men to moles, forcing them to bring the overcrowded length of the Fall evening to bear upon the summer-spurned face of their sorrow.

For winds of October allow no compromise, no sudden sweet soaring of the befriended heart, no tracing of the finger along the earth's rim; allow instead, eyes' swift avoidance of eyes, a period when man must set himself apart to retain for himself a small portion of him.

P. K. Page.

#### Ode: The Eumenides

If we could go again to the innocent wood Where the crisp floor muffles the tread And the classic shade of cedar and pine Soothes the depraved head In the children's glen, It might be that the casual dead In their stained shrouds Would not find us there.

These times indeed Breed anguisk.

Betrayed by the bold front and the bright line How shall we return to the significant dark Of piety and fear Where Holiness smoothed our hair And Honor kissed us goodbye?

Where foreheads bleed The cry is blood!

We have a date in another wood,
In the stifling dark, where the Furies are:
The unravelled implacable host
With accurate eyes levelled
Wait in the enchanted shade—
Where we spilled our bloodshot seed
They wait, each patient ghost
My ruined son.

The Furies lift the veil—
I know that face!

A. J. M. Smith.

†THE LONGEST JOURNEY: E. M. Forster; New Classics-New Directions; \$1.00.

#### Mutable Hearts

Now with a rush the children of men tackle the windswirled slope,
their olive shirts windplastered to their ribs their cries flashing under the throstled sky, to meet the autumn.

Is it so swift out of mind—
the brambled valley of summer
that shivers yet in its thin ornaments
left desolate, now,
till from late silken threads of light
invisibility be spun complete?

The counterpoint is shabby that cannot suffer its own ridicule.

Motionless, in the seamurmurous dark room she sits intent to focus with her stricken wisdom the corded truth about the son from whom so long she beat away the leaden angels—indomitable, lifting her knuckled forehead to the indifferent sea-salt of the dark.

Out of that locus though, the boy

is fleet: perhaps gone forth
not on the windy sea, but down a street
to spit on the warm sawdust in the fish store,
or on the mealy cone-strewn forest earth
to skewer, cinnamon-strong;
and many a crooked way
till amidst vasty snowfields
the purple shadows shoulder him,
and out of the bright-needled winter wilds

to find her gazing out
with wilful wisdom, in her cheated pride;
to dabble with her dream
that sin is in his flickering, and the sun
and seasons.

he returns home:

What is the drag against the current?

Why does the look of god shine still
above the rushy pool
while cold swords wait beyond the sweeping curve
of the dark river?

On the blown ridge now tilt the children of men
borne in the breathy brown frost-foaming air.

Margaret Avison.



A ROOM WITH A VIEW: E. M. Forster; New Classics-New Directions; \$1.00.

STOP P-U-R-R-I-N-G

#### THE WAR ISN'T WON YET....

Sure, we're doing well... but it isn't over, and we can't afford to relax our efforts as long as there is a single one of our men within range of enemy fire, nor as long as the Axis has any fighting ability left.

We can hasten victory. We can speed the end of the war. We can get our men back home, victorious, a good deal sooner, if we do our part without slackening, without complacency.

And we can quicken the coming of peace and happiness in which our wartime thrift will be rewarded. The Victory Bonds we have bought during the war will be our keys to opportunity, and to the enjoyment of new things when the war is won.

The Fifth Victory Loan will start October 18th. Lend your savings to your country—and plan to lend more out of income.

Every dollar you put into these bonds is still your dollar, earning good interest, growing into a nest-egg that ensures your future. You are not giving... you are LENDING, and what you lend is helping to shorten the war, to hasten the happy days.

# GET READY TO BUY MORE VICTORY BONDS

October, 1943



# PLANNING POST-WAR CANADA

A Special Section of THE CANADIAN FORUM

October, 1943

# Mr. Macdonnell Replies to His Critics

▶ IN THE AUGUST CANADIAN FORUM I wrote on "The Case for Individual Enterprise" and Mr. Scott replied. In the September number Mr. Hankin commented on what both of us had written and Mr. Scott made further comment on Mr. Hankin. It is now my turn to reply.

Mr. Scott and I are far apart and indeed we seem like parallel lines which never meet. I prefer, however, in the space available not to seek to attack him all along the line but to single out a few points which seem to me most important.

Incidentally let me say that there is this great satisfaction in carrying on a controversy with Mr. Scott—that you know where you are. He is an out-and-out socialist and does not pretend to be anything else. Some of his CCF colleagues, notably Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Jolliffe, seem at times to be greatly concerned to disguise their Socialism. But then, of course, they have to consider votes.

In the first place, a few words as to some of Mr. Scott's statements of fact.

(1) Mr. Scott says: "The agricultural industry in Canada kept its price of farm machinery almost level when the price of wheat had dropped to rock bottom; result, more income to the industry but unemployment among its workers and no machinery on the farms."

The facts are as follows: It is true that prices of machinery dropped little, if any. It is not true that there was "more income to the industry." On the contrary there was greatly decreased income. In fact the Massey-Harris Company, the largest company in the industry in Canada, suffered losses (including necessary write-downs and readjustments) each year from 1930 to 1936 totalling in all over \$22,000,000, and no dividends whatever were paid to any class of its shareholders for eleven years from 1931 to 1941.

(2) Mr. Scott, in criticizing the price charged by the Aluminium Company, says: "Meanwhile [he is referring to the period since 1931] the cost of making aluminum has fallen greatly, particularly in Canada." Aluminium Limited, the Canadian Company, itself states that the costs of producing crude aluminum today are about 30 per cent. higher than in 1931 and about 85 per cent. higher than in 1939. This is due largely to increased costs of ocean freights and of labor.

(3) Mr. Scott says: "How . . . justify giving the Bell Telephone Company a monopoly position which removes risk and allowing it a cool 8% when the little buyer of War Bonds gets 3%?" Mr. Hankin has already pointed out that "Mr. Scott is wrong . . . in conveying the impression that the investor in Bell Telephone shares enjoys a return of 8%. Actually this figure represents a return of about 5% on the real investment." I should like to add that there is nothing sacrosanct about the 8%—in 1935 and 1936 it was 6%, and in 1937 7%. The average yield from 1935 to 1942, taking into account average prices of the stock during the same period, has been 4.92%. Having in mind what Mr.

Hankin points out, that the business is subject to substantial risks from new investment, I doubt if anyone will regard this as an undue return. Certainly it is a very different story from the 8% which Mr. Scott mentions.

I have taken pains to get the truth on these matters and believe I have succeeded. If so, I can only say that these misstatements of Mr. Scott are most unfortunate and do much harm by clouding the issue. I feel it is a great pity that on such vital matters where there is room for wide difference of opinion among honest and fair-minded men even when all the facts are agreed on, the difficulties of reaching a common ground, which ought to be the aim of us all, should be so vastly increased by misstatements such

In this article, Mr. Macdonnell replies to the criticisms of his statement, "The Case for Individual Enterprise," made by Mr. F. R. Scott and Mr. Francis Hankin. His reply to Mr. Eugene Forsey will appear in this section next month.

as these. I dislike saying this, particularly in view of Mr. Scott's kindly exempting me from some of his criticisms, but I think the matter is too important to refrain from expressing my true feelings.

Moreover, I wonder whether it is his readiness to believe evil of men which produces a state of mind which permits Mr. Scott to talk of those who differ from him on these questions as if they were actuated by nothing but ruthles selfishness—indeed as if they were in effect public enemies. The truth is that these men whom he criticizes (I am thinking particularly at the moment of those engaged in production) are just like other members of the community except that they have on the whole more energy, more courage, more resourcefulness and more initiative. These qualities do, of course, go along sometimes with a certain ruthlessness and high-handedness, but to leave the impression, as he does that these men are cold, calculating, ruthless, unsympathetic, is about as fair as it would be to say that every labor leader is a racketeer. Further, to suggest that the increasing sense of social responsibility which business feels is nothing but fear for possessions-well, I doubt if fair-minded people will

I come now to Mr. Scott's suggestion that the war has fully solved the problem of employment and in so doing it has proved that private enterprise is a positive obstacle to progress. Here are his words: "Then came the war and the introduction of some degree of social planning which has incontestably proved that so soon as we abandon capitalist methods we became vastly more efficient. The national income is now three times as large as ten years ago. Instead of unemployment we have a shortage of labor . . . How is this possible? Because public enterprise, called 'the war effort,' has invaded certain fields formerly left to private enterprise."

This is a very simple explanation of our present state of full employment. Many people have thought it was more largely due to other things. First of all, instead of markets hermetically sealed against us we have had the insatiable expec (\$5,5 Final Lease probl solve are n enter

Octo

all or

Re: "25,00 manu 25,000 fellow I have 25,000 man dustry

attent

treati

the sa

comm

priva

I contact the experiment of th

Let refer to not, o which are ce cratic is any

Let

organi

the fe

domes
at the
mainta
from v
all inv
prices
would
Scott
any re
industi

done of representations recentalifications um.

tial

gard

tory

and

hese

n of

suci

Mr.

SIMS.

ieve

mits

hese

less

nies.

duc-

cept

age, do,

ness

oes,

etic,

ader

ense

but

will

has

g it

e to

the

has

onal

w is

vate

e of

1016

kets

demands of war suddenly giving us a market for nearly all our products. Next, by tremendous efforts (and of course assisted by increased production) we have stepped up our taxation and borrowing till in the current fiscal year we expect to raise nearly eleven times our pre-war budget (\$5,500,000,000 as against something over \$500,000,000). Finally, raw materials have been made available through Lease-Lend and other pooling arrangements, so that our problems of obtaining essential raw materials have been solved. But apparently in Mr. Scott's mind these things are merely incidential. To him it was all "because public enterprise... has invaded certain fields formerly left to private enterprise." Surely the socialist case is capable of a better statement than this.

Referring to my statement that there are more than "25,000 separate organizations in Canada in the field of manufacturing alone," Mr. Scott says: "His figures of the 25,000 separate organizations mean almost nothing since 24,900 of these are dominated at every turn by the big fellows." This statement is almost as unwarranted as those I have previously quoted and commented on. Why not say 25,000 are dominated and have done with it? No sensible man will deny that the problem of domination of one industry by another is a real one which should engage the attention of serious men. I do not feel that Mr. Scott is treating the matter seriously, and as Mr. Forsey has asked the same question in a serious manner I shall reserve my comments for him.

I come now to one statement of Mr. Scott which goes to the root of the whole matter and with which I wish to deal particularly. In my remarks I said: "Let us be clear as to the exact meaning of the Fully Planned Economy. Let us describe it in plain, intelligible words. It means this: that a few persons assume to have a superhuman wisdom to decide what the rest of us are to produce and consume—it means a few individuals who plan and give orders and a whole population who obey." Commenting on my statement that planning by the few is contemplated in the Fully Planned Economy, Mr. Scott says: "In that case I reject the Fully Planned Economy. The planning I contemplate is a planning in which the people as a whole through their democratic organizations play the leading part. Planning by the few for the few is what we have under monopoly capitalism. We have too much of it already."

Let us try to come to grips on this crucial point. When I refer to "a few individuals who plan and give orders" I do not, of course, deny that there will be many minor things which can be democratically done. Even in Russia there are certain minor matters dealt with by apparently democratic methods, but I think no one will suggest that there is anything democratic about the major decisions in Russia.

Let us make this point practical by applying it to our domestic situation at the moment. If Mr. Scott has his way, at the end of the war the controls presently existing will be maintained and no doubt extended. It is abundantly clear from what he says that he would for example desire (1) that all investments should be controlled by the state; (2) that prices should be set by law; (3) that imports and exports would be possible only under government license. Does Mr. Scott think that these things can be democratically done in any real sense? Does he picture a meeting of farmers and industrial workers democratically fixing the prices of each other's products? He will reply, no doubt, that it will be done democratically in the sense that it is done by elected representatives. He must know, however, as pointed out recently in a series of two-minute talks on socialism, that "governments must be autocratic in carrying on the day-

#### SEEMS LOGICAL - TO NEW ZEALAND!

We bave built in New Zealand, alongside our fighting policy — our war policy — a social security system. The idea behind the social security system is that in so far as a person is unable to care for himself or herself then it is a collective responsibility to see that those things necessary for physical welfare and cultural life are made available to them; and we have expressed it in words of this type: that the first charge on all the wealth created should be the care of the aged, the care of the young, the care of the invalid; and of those engaged in the production of essential utilities. The aged, because of the fact that the standards we enjoy today, would not bave been possible bad it not been for the work they have done in past years. For the young, because we must provide for the future. We must see that the environment and the influences which mould the character of those who are now growing up are such that they will be able with the knowledge and experience they acquire to make a better world than the world they inherited. For the ailing, because they cannot provide for themselves; and ordinary buman decency demands that they should share along with ourselves and others the good things that are available. That is the simple philosophy that is behind the war policy of the government in New Zealand.

> Hon. Walter Nash, addressing the House of Commons Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment, 1942 (Proceedings, p. 82).

to-day matters which they deal with" and that if government operates our economic life instead of regulating it then our economic life will be autocratically controlled. Our safeguard at present is that the great bulk of the economic life of the state is carried on by individuals operating under regulation and control. Under Socialism this will be changed. Power will be taken away from those who exercise it now under control (which control may be as wide as public opinion demands) and power will be given to men who will exercise it with no real control of any kind.

How do Mr. Scott and his confreres escape these conclusions? The truth seems to be that socialists succeed in making themselves believe that power in their hands will be different from power in the hands of others. In answer to the argument that major decisions must be made by a few men, one of the socialist leaders used to me not long ago words to this effect: "We think that in our party the rank and file will be so close to the leaders that there will really be no occasion for the exercise of authority." I mentioned this to a former Minister of the Crown. His reply was, with a metaphoric wringing of the hands, "Will people not realize that governments must govern?"

Mr. Scott says that we have too much planning by the few under monopoly capitalism. While I do not admit this but on the contrary repeat that we have planning now by the many, nevertheless even if it were true, planning under the non-Socialist state is always subject to review by the will of the people as expressed in government, whereas I repeat that under Mr. Scott's plan there will be no review. There will be no one to control the controllers.

Thus by a different route we find ironically enough that Socialism by undertaking to plan fully our economy will

have inevitably to exercise the same controls as in the Fascist states. They will find, even the benevolent and well-meaning ones, that power in their hands will have to be exercised as absolute power always is exercised. Incidentally that will mean that the benevolent and well-meaning ones will be ousted by those in their ranks who understand what power really does mean. I don't doubt there are such, though they may not be the present leaders.

That socialism will have the results which I have described would appear to be fully acknowledged by such people as Mrs. Webb, G. D. H. Cole (Mr. Forsey adds Harold Laski) and certainly by Bernard Shaw, who scoffs at the idea that Parliament could ever run a socialist state. These authorities are apparently so obsessed by the prospects of the material good which they think socialism will bring that they are ready to forgo the things for which we are commonly supposed to be fighting. Is Mr. Scott ready to forego these things too or does he, like Mr. Forsey, think that these leading socialists are wrong in their political views?

One further point. Mr. Scott knows much better than I that in advocating socialism he is not advocating anything new. He is aware that the regimented state has been tried before, with the results which I have outlined. Does he think, with the example of the totalitarian states before him, that in the 20th Century regimentation will produce different results from those in the past?

To sum up. We are being asked to abandon the great Anglo-Saxon discovery that political and social stability depends on a distribution of power. Socialists propose that economic power, which plays such an important part in the lives of all of us and which is at present distributed between private enterprise and government, should be concentrated in the hands of government. They thus clearly propose to destroy economic liberty in the sense in which it is defined by Professor Ernest Barker as "a power of original action or, in other words, self-determination resident in the individual and relative to the area of economic activity."

Why should we follow this extreme course when there is a middle road, namely, the combination of state and private enterprise? Mr. Churchill has pointed the way. What we need, he says, is "that state enterprise and free enterprise both serve national interests and pull the national wagon side by side." Mr. Churchill has also given us a significant warning of what happens if we take the other course. "We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privilege."

I must deal briefly with Mr. Hankin's comments.

Mr. Hankin may be quite right in saying that I do not "emphasize sufficiently the conditions under which the freedom it [private enterprise] enjoys may be permitted to continue." Nevertheless I can assure him that I myself and those who share my views will agree that there must be more "disciplines" of business, to use his word, than before the war.

Without committing myself to all that he says about control I would go a long way with him. One particular reservation I would make on the matter of state control of investments. I would hope that there might be guidance and a readiness of government to step into the field of investment in case of emergency, but that we might be spared the rigidity of actual control. The Lever memorandum and other similar memoranda suggest a method by which government may play this role, which one may describe as a "pinchhitter" investor.

#### BUT THEY DO NOT PLAN!

Mr. Castleden: Should we not have some kind of planning board which will first of all look into the social needs of our own people, the sort of things you have been outlining to us, that will provide work for all, and give help to all?

Dr. Cyril James: I have a boly fear of setting up new boards, and particularly of anything as comprehensive as a planning board. After all, reconstruction affects every detail of Canadian life. It affects every individual man, woman and child from the time they go to school to the time when they retire on pension, or eventually die. It affects every part of our industry and agriculture. If you set up a planning board, its jurisdiction would be co-extensive with that of the cabinet and parliament. . . My own feeling is that the cabinet itself and parliament, as they are now constituted, constitute a planning board.

Proceedings of the House of Commons Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment, 1942, p. 73.

I subscribe fully to what Mr. Hankin says about the pressure of conflicting groups if our present system is replaced by socialism, where government instead of being the regulator, the referee, the guide becomes itself the active operator. We have pressure groups now of course, but nevertheless much is decided by the action and inter-action of economic forces. Under socialism everything would be done by pressure groups seeking to get the ear of those exercising the supreme authority.

Mr. Hankin, while anxious, like myself, that personal liberty should be "invaded as little as possible," seems to suggest that the choice is between "liberty" on the one hand and "efficiency and equity" on the other hand. I cannot quite believe that Mr. Hankin wishes to suggest this alternative and in particular to suggest that there is more efficiency under government operation in the sense that production of goods for the community would be greater. However freely we admit the need of controls and regulations for private enterprise, I do not believe that it can be seriously doubted that so far as actual productive effort is concerned our experience to date shows that it will be greater under private enterprise. I think myself that if we assess the situation realistically we find it hard to escape this conclusion. Leaving out the exceptional men, for example many of our senior civil servants, there is a disposition among those in government employ to feel that something less than an all-out effort will get by. Take for example the simple matter of economy. It is hard for the ordinary man in the government service to resist the feeling that there is no limit to the amount of money available through taxation, that there is no danger of his job coming to an end because it is too expensive to carry it on.

Let me take a rather simple illustration of which I have some personal knowledge. I think anyone who has served in the army, which after all is the greatest socialist enterprise we have ever had (I am referring to the army entirely on its business side and not on its battle side), will admit that on its business side it falls far short of the business efficiency of private enterprise. I defy anyone with army experience to deny this, and while I do not press the illustration unduly, nevertheless I think anyone who knows the Army will recognize that there is not and can hardly be the same sense of day to day urgency as in ordinary civilian life.

rate taxe ital men velo be t gove aim

priva

after

caus

slum

00

Lin

pro

trie

Pro

Tor

can

acti

cess

late

whi

adm

inve

indu

inte

as p

"the

priv

indu

ship the s Mr. talk great will of atten profit

dream

Twis the tends frank not of Level which about sider plan. regul

unem

the I

the

tive

ver-

of

one

to

and

not

ncy

ely rate

ez-

rate

tion

av-

ern-

fort

mv.

of

ger

to:

ter-

mit

my

tra-

the

# Leverplanners Seek to Salvage Capitalism

▶ THE DIRECTORS of Lever Brothers and Unilever Limited, soap manufacturers, whose business "embraces production, transport, manufacture and marketing, with more than six hundred establishments in thirty-eight countries," have issued a Canadian edition of their study, "The Problem of Unemployment" (Oxford University Press, Toronto; 63 pages; 25 cents).

Briefly, the Lever plan, conceding that private industry cannot itself abolish unemployment, proposes government action to regulate capital investment. They see that the succession of booms and depressions (the "trade cycle") is related to the irregular development of productive capacity which in turn causes irregularity of employment. They admit that "the profit motive is an insufficient guide" to investment. While a "self-imposed discipline on the part of industry" might help and "might become one of the aims of international industrial agreements," they reject corporatism as placing overwhelming powers in the hands of industry— "the public would sense in it the creation of an era of privilege." So, repudiating direct government control over industry, to say nothing of a socialized economy, they plump for government regulation of investment.

This would be achieved by raising or lowering interest rates, expanding or contracting credit, raising or lowering taxes, changing the rate of depreciation allowed on new capital for taxation purposes, and speeding or slowing government capital expenditures. Special public works and development expenditures, and occupational training, would be timed to "take up the slack" of unemployment, and the government would set up a social security program. The aim would be to counteract the well-known tendency of private capital to increase investment and productive capacity after these had reached a socially desirable point and so cause overproduction and a slump, and to dry up when a slump is in sight and so hasten the plunge into productive idleness and unemployment.

The Lever plan is thus the now familiar call for "partner-ship between government and industry." It is substantially the same proposal as that of Dr. Alvin Hansen, analyzed by Mr. Beder elsewhere in this issue. The Leverplanners, too, talk of a "second" or "conplementary" budget. It has one great defect—it won't work. The hope that private industry will co-operate tamely in peacetime with a government which attempts to apply even these mild controls, so long as the profit motive is left free to operate generally, is a utopian dream.

Two points, however, distinguish this presentation. One is the frankness with which it shows how private capitalism tends to bedevil our economic life. The other is the equally frank admission that such regulation as is proposed would not end unemployment—only "mass unemployment." The Leverplanners guess that it would leave a residue of jobless which "would very likely be lower than 8½ per cent."—about the same percentage as Sir William Beveridge considered it necessary to provide for under his social security plan. But Beveridge based his estimate on our present unregulated economy; if proper measures were taken he thinks unemployment could be reduced below that level. The best the Leverplanners can suggest would still leave at least 8½ per cent. unemployed. Indeed, they seem to think this not

only inevitable, but desirable. For contraction or expansion of the 8½ per cent. would provide the best means of telling whether we were approaching a boom or a slump, thus warning the government to take action. (A "reserve of unemployed" has always been considered a desideratum by private industry when it came to bargaining about wages).

In essence, the report is an attempt to show how the profit motive can be preserved without too obvious a danger of running us again on the rocks, on the assumption that the profit motive is indispensable and synonymous with "freedom." But there is so much evidence to indicate that not only is the profit motive not indispensable, but that we can't hope to get very far in achieving a sane and rational society until we dispense with it in the major productive areas, that intelligent people are getting a little tired of the various plans to make the world safe for capitalism.

Nevertheless, we recommend this pamphlet to our readers. While it makes out as good a case as can be made out for controlled capitalism, there are implicit in it all the best arguments against the cause it pleads. Its disinterested tone should deceive no one.

## "Of Things to Come"

► THE CBC HAS collected the series of sixteen broadcasts, "Of Things to Come," dealing with Canada's post-war problems, on which Morley Callaghan, well-known Canadian novelist, did such a swell job as Counsel for the People, in a book of 228 pages which sells for 25 cents.

These discussions by politicians, newspaper editors, university professors, public officials, business men, industrial workers, bankers, farmers and clergymen covered such topics as the last peace and the next one, planned economy, wartime controls, free enterprise, employment, immigration, housing, health, nutrition, the Marsh plan, farm security, provincial affairs, and the Atlantic Charter. They ended with a progress report by R. E. G. Davis, director of the Canadian Youth Commission, Evan Gray, K.C., Dr. Robert Newton, president of the University of Alberta, and Mr. Callaghan.

Preparation was assisted by committees of representative citizens. The discussions were, of course, designed primarily to be listened to, not read. It is only natural that their informality and their occasional, shall we say inconsecutiveness, may be less satisfying to the reader than they might have been to the listener. Yet they have the provocative quality which stimulates interest, and we recommend them in their printed form especially to those who are just becoming aware of the magnitude of our post-war task. It is fair to say they have brought the "forum" technique of presenting controversial issues over the air to near-perfection.

Yet this form has its limitations—it is bound to have a certain confusing effect because of the need to even off arguments and end on the note: "There is much to be said on all sides." But allowing for this disadvantage, we need more of such round tables on the radio, and in this and its farm and labor forums the CBC has set a very high standard indeed. But we need also frank and forthright speakers who will present contentious views to be judged on their merits without the somewhat artificial handicap of a "now it's your turn" atmosphere. We hope the CBC will continue to give us both.

Octo

didn't

skyist

move

taking

officia

with .

"Y

"N

"I 1

munis

"Ye

Her I

portec

war b

war.

give it

throug

says?

the fa

of pro

hard

might

trade

of orga

in pri

uniust

I tu

in my

don't

Labor

not th

Labor

theorie

in Par

mprov

omic i

of the

"An

"Wh

lady.

nicest

ometi

collect

peake

far in

around

I ro

ound.

"Con

He l

next de

ant. In

on a cr

Variati

Whi

much

the res

"Ple

"Th

"If

"W

"So

"T

# **Report from England**

#### L. W. Henderson

#### ► Dear Folks at Home:

I guess you have been wondering why you haven't heard from me more of late. Well, you know how it is. It's hard to get down to writing letters. But, having recently got back from a seven-day leave, it occurred to me you might like to meet some of the people I met and see what I saw, for I found how little we at home know of life over here. I may not have been able to present a balanced picture of society, but that has not been my intention. If I give you some inkling of the thoughts and spirit that is moving this nation, after four years of war, that is enough.

#### 1-The Crown and Anchor

In the suburbs of London, near Putney Bridge, I came upon The Crown and Anchor. Of an evening, the air is usually thick with smoke and the buzz of conversation, for the people who come here like to talk. The traditionally silent Englishman becomes a most garrulous creature over his pint of beer.

"Madame," the mistress of the bar, sets this tone with a mysterious air of having played a role in the great political upheavals of the past. She is a French refugee, she will tell you, although she has presided at the Crown and Anchor as long as anyone can remember. Her walls are hung with gigantic lithographs depicting scenes on the barricades and suitably inscribed with verses from *The Marseillaise*.

"It will not be long, you will see," Madame will confide across the bar if you offer her a drink. "The Boche is a pig! C'est un saoul! France will conquer because our strength is here" (tapping her forehead). "Raison! Reason will show the way."

These tours de force are greeted with applause and set light to the general conversation. For these people are middle-class working men and women, like the makers of the French Revolution, who believe in the power of the mind to control their destiny.

The night the Comintern was dissolved, the Crown and Anchor was in a state of rare excitement. Looking about for a familiar face I caught the eye of Ulysse, a Swiss friend I had met here before.

"What's up tonight, Ulysse?"

"Well, you see, some think the world's coming to an end and others think it's coming to a beginning," he replied whimsically.

"Be good enough to introduce me to some who think it is beginning; the other is old stuff," I said.

"You won't need any introduction. You are going to meet some of the greatest radicals in town. Follow me."

After much pushing and squeezing I found myself securely wedged on a wall bench between a Jewish chap smoking a very evil-smelling cigar, and an elderly gentleman with a haircut that might best be described as a long bob. Both utterly ignored my intrusion. Across the table, sprawled in an armchair, a tubercular-looking girl, flaxen hair clinging untidily to an earnest face, feet thrust out before her in running shoes with the toes coming through. Ulysse told me afterwards that she is the daughter of a magistrate and granddaughter of the most famous English scientist of the last century. She was saying, "Don't you see that the ostensible objection to affiliation has now been cut entirely from under your feet?"

"No, I don't," growled the Jew, emitting a cloud of toxic

smoke, "and I wish you would explain what you mean by ostensible."

"Oh, don't be so tiresome, Frank," she retorted. "You know perfectly well that when the Communist Party first applied for affiliation with the Labor Party, it was refused on the grounds that the C.P. was subject to the Communist International on orders from Moscow. Now that Stalin has dissolved the International you haven't a leg to stand on. Because that wasn't your real reason for not admitting us. You are afraid lest we infiltrate your ranks so deeply that at the next election you will have to come our way or else lose a lot of your old seats to us."

"Drinks for five," I said to Madame.

Frank began puffing harder than ever.

"The arrogance of the C.P. . . . exceeds all bounds," he said. "What makes you think Labor gives a tuppenny damn where you go?"

"Solidarity of the working class," said the girl, raising her glass. "Or have you gone back on that, too?"

"Certainly not, but it is useless to try to unite principles

fundamentally opposed."

"Oh, then what have you got to say for the present affiliation of Labor with the Government? Or has Labor become so capitalist in its association with Tory circles that its views are no longer fundamentally opposed to those of

His Majesty's Government?"
"Will no one tell me what all this is about?" I intervened.
"It's about a lot of nonsense." This from the member of our group who had not spoken yet. He rose, and though

not tall, he seemed to dominate the table.

"Young man," he said, addressing me, "if you are going to know anything about politics in this country you will have to learn straightaway that no one does anything from a disinterested motive or for the reason he gives for doing it. The Labor Party has joined the Government. Why? Who benefited most from the union, the Government or the Labor

"I-I don't know."

"The Labor Party, dolt! Else they'd never have joined. That is how they have extended their party influence preparatory to the next election."

A low groan escaped from Frank. The stranger went on: "Now you have the Communists doing the same thing. They want to be affiliated with Labor, who are already affiliated with the Tories. Everybody is affiliated with somebody else in the house that Jack built in order to get something out of him."

"Do you not believe then, that men can work together successfully for the good of men?" I asked.

"Only under Socialism, lad. Instead of working with the bondholders to increase the slavery of the masses, Labor should come out in opposition to the Government and demand a socialist Britain that can offer its producers something else than blood, sweat, tears and toil for rent, interest and profits!"

"But I suppose we must unite to win the war," I said.

"What good is it if the common man loses the peace? And he will lose it if there is no one to speak for him" (he looked defiantly around) "and all his friends go a-calling at the Squire's house hoping to be entertained for tea. I say no co-operation with this Government of imperialists and profiteers. Socialism now or never!" He pulled down his broad-brimmed black hat and slouched away.

"Who is he?" I asked.

"Trotskyist!" hissed the girl.

"Fascist!" spat the Jew.

Ulysse's eyes twinkled. "A professor. Quite harmless really. He's a member of the Independent Labor Party."

nas

us.

he

mn

ing

oles

ent

be-

hat

of

ned.

r of

ugh

ing

will

rom

Vho

ber

ned.

pre-

on:

ing.

ady

me-

me-

ther

the

abor

de-

me-

erest

d.

And

ked

the

no no

oad-

"I'm not quite sure what a Trotskyist is, but I'm sure he didn't sound like a Fascist," I said in amazement.

"They are one and the same, really," said the girl. "Trotskyism no longer represents a trend in the working-class movement. It originated as left-wing Communism, but by taking part in the opposition from the Right against the official party line it has been discredited and is identified with Fascism."

"You think the Trotskyists want a Fascist victory?"

"Naturally, that is apparent."

"I remember when it also seemed apparent that the Com-

munists wanted a Fascist victory.

"You have been misled by anti-proletarian propaganda." Her Marxian lingo never failed her. "The C.P. never supported a Fascist victory. In 1939 we abstained from the war because there was nothing to distinguish it as a people's war. Subsequently it changed its character, and we now give it our entire support."

"So you believe now that you can get a Socialist Britain through this war, in spite of what our Trotskyist friend

"We can and we will. The first battle is being waged in the factories. We advocate common ownership of the means of production, and the factory is the production point."

"If your factory groups did less proselytizing and more hard bargaining like the trade unions," said Frank, "you

might be doing the workers a lot more good."
"Please explain the difference between factory groups and

trade unions," I put in.
"The factory group," said the girl, "is one principal unit of organization. It is responsible for giving political leadership to all party members in the factory. We are interested in principles, not in haggling over a few miserable pennies an hour with an industrial system we consider inherently

turned to Frank inquiringly.

"I am a shop-steward," he said. "I represent the workers in my department in all disputes with the management. I don't haggle, I discuss, knowing I have the weight of the labor Party behind me, and I think I can fairly say it is not the workers who are always worked. The object of the labor movement has never been to invent high-flown social theories. We have simply sought through our representation n Parliament to voice the needs of the working man and to improve his lot. The affiliated trade unions protect his economic interests, while the co-operatives protect the interests of the workers as consumers."

"And what are the co-operatives?" I asked.

"Why, I am a co-operative," said a neat little gray-haired lady. "I buy all my food at the co-op shop, and we have the nicest teas every Thursday afternoon. We own all our own shops and share all the profits between us in dividends. Sometimes they send down a speaker from London and we collect funds for something or other. Last week we had a peaker on China. She said the Co-operatives in China are ar in advance of our own; they even carry their factories around with them on their backs."

I rose unsteadily to my feet. "Ulysse, my head's going

round."

Come with me," he said.

He led me away through a back entrance to his own room next door. In his working hours Ulysse is a brewer's assistant. In his spare time he is a pianist. I flung myself down a cushion at the foot of his piano. He began the Brahms variations on a theme by Handel.

While listening to those adagio chords I wondered how much of all this political consciousness seeped through to the rest of England. Were the other forty millions all aware of the shifting sands of Right and Left and the intricate patterns of each? If not, did all this talk matter? Or was it the rustle of a reed in the rising wind?

2-London Bridge Is Falling Down

Looking out on the suburbs and West End of London from the top of a bus, you see very little to remind you of the Blitz. But as you reach the East End, the real proportions of that nightmare are brought home to you. Go eastward along Holborn or Fleet St., and you will see that nearly every building bears the scars of battle. Behind St. Paul's all semblance of a city is lost. Only the acres of cellars remain like a vast ant-hill that has been displaced by a casual boot. Cheapside . . . Watling Street . . . Newgate . Along these thoroughfares of desolation flow the buses, bicycles and the unchanging faces of the Londoners.

If you stop to ask them what they think of it all, they will give you an ironic smile but not say much. Perhaps the irony is this: The horror of this scene is not the barbarity of destruction, so much as the revelation of the insect life of man. It seems incredible and shameful to realize that men lived like this, in tiny burrows, row upon row endlessly, without light or air or room to turn. One cannot feel sorrow for what has gone, in spite of all the destitution, suffering and death. There is a steely determination that it must not be brought back again.

Among the ruins some demolition laborers were sitting around an open fire, frying sausages for lunch. They passed the same old Cockney banter: "All right, 'Arry, just dip yer bread in the pan. No need to give it a bloody bath!" They hailed me and asked for a snapshot. I took them in some precarious and ridiculous poses, and then we repaired to a

pub on what used to be Old Bailey.

The conversation turned on the demolition.

"Do you think they will rebuild these tenements after the war?" I asked.

"Who's to stop them, mate? The land all belongs to the hospital, the Church mission and the ground landlords. They're not going to give up their profits, are they?"

"But surely the Government will buy it up and turn it into modern municipal buildings?"

"Oh, ah! But wait a minute. Who are the Government?

The landlords, o' course!" Was it like that in Canada and America, they wanted to know? I tried to evade: "It's like that anywhere, I guess."
"'Ow about Russia?" came a deep voice from the back.

"Don't get us wrong, mate," another interrupted quickly, "We're no Reds. We only want fair play, and a chance to get a decent living."

"No, you're wrong there, chum," retorted the deep voice again. "We want more'n that. We want what we earn for ourselves. Community ownership of property. That means community ownership of profit."

I hope I have conveyed the confusion of thought and at the same time the stubbornness of purpose of these men. Perhaps they spoke in ignorance and consequently in error. But they are a loud voice in England, and it is well to know

what they are saying.

What the working man wants, he says, is not security bought from the Government and paid for in taxes. He wants the opportunity to make his own economic future. The average working man has come to distrust all party politics. He is acutely unenthusiastic about the type of parliamentary democracy which he has enjoyed longer than in any other European nation. Rightly or wrongly, he regards the freedom of enterprise it offered with skepticism. He is fighting, in so far as he has a clearly defined reason, to create some sort of planned society, which is capable of controlling the causes of social injustice and war. Thus far his political thinking has been done under the shock and privation of war. The situation presents an opportunity which any demagogue who can catch the popular imagination might use to the advantage of himself, or his party, or his class.

I stopped for lunch at a discreet restaurant, overshadowed by the gaunt remains of Bow Church. Here the City men still lunch punctually at noon, and drink their Carlsberg lager from gold-rimmed glasses . . . amid the Sahara of London.

An impeccably dressed young man deposited his bowler hat and rolled umbrella, and took a seat at my table. Presently we were joined by a scholarly man with horn-rimmed spectacles and a brief-case. These two appeared to know one another distantly.

The business man had lately returned to London from an evacuation of two years in the country. I asked if the decentralization of business, occasioned by the war, was not a good thing as a solution to the problem of congestion in London.

"A good thing for Government planning," he said with a nod at our companion, "but not for competitive business."

I inquired what was the relationship of the Government to business. "Mr. Grundy," retorted the business man contemptuously.

"Let me put it more fairly," said the Government man.
"For the duration of the war the Government is acting as an intermediary for control and co-operation. Now take my case. My job is to arrange for the exchange and loan of tools among war industries, so that there is no shortage of equipment in one place and surplus in another."

"Do the firms co-operate?" I asked.

"Most firms are only too glad to co-operate. It cuts down their overhead and prevents idleness. But our friend here represents a firm of tool-makers who get a profit out of selling factories more tools than they really need if they pool resources."

"And what is the result of this co-operative system? You have removed competition, and ruined the incentive to increased production," said the other.

"There is no prosperity where there is waste, my friend."

"There is no prosperity at all without competition, and your excess profits tax put an end to that."

"The excess profits tax has not restricted the economic incentive of the actual producers, but only of the people, such as shareholders, who do not contribute in any way to the war."

"But see here, if you eliminate the competition between the owners of industry they'll have no reason to reduce costs, and every reason to spread all they can now to improve their future competitive position after the war."

I asked if Government control of industry would likely be continued after the war.

"Well, that depends who you mean by the Government," countered the business man. "The Government claims to be controlling industry now, but the controllers themselves are largely representatives of industry. Who is the Government in regard to coal, or iron or steel? It is a self-governing body of that particular industry, operating under the authority of the Ministry of Supply."

I thought reflectively of 'Arry, and his "Oh, ah! But who are the Government?"

"The industrialists do not oppose control, then?" I pursued

"Certainly not," he replied, "if it is they who have the control. It is a case of monopoly control against state control. Monopoly control makes it possible for the industrialists to fix collective prices so as to yield the greatest total profits. That is the type of Government control they aim for, and in my opinion the only kind that will give properity."

The other furrowed his brow. "But you see the Government has also got to provide for social security after the war. Unemployment is inevitable so long as industries run their affairs in their own interest on a basis of monopoly."

I asked: "Could this control of monopoly be effected by the present policy of central organization and restriction under the thumb of the industrialists themselves, or would it not have to lead to eventual public ownership of industry?"

This ended the discussion, for I had posed the question over which all parties are bogged down. It is the Rubion of English politics.

There are apparently few who believe that there can be any return to an economic system which England, more than any other, evolved, and which America has developed to the full—the exploitation by private enterprise—whatever kind of Government succeeds in England.

London Bridge still stands. But what it stands for, the great tradition of a proud social structure, has fallen down as completely as the tenements in the Blitz.

# Racial Discrimination in Canada

### Douglas MacLennan

WE ARE IN THE MIDST of a revolution, a social transformation. The enslaved peoples look to us who are still free. Are they to believe that our parochial attitude or racial questions indicates our lack of interest in their problems? If we do countenance a continuance of this racial discrimination, we are dooming ourselves to another war, be cause it will mean that the Eastern peoples, for instance, will not believe we are sincere about the Atlantic Charter, or any other charter. At first there will be confusion and squabbling; and the confusion will grow from molehill to mountainous proportions. We need to avoid destructive emotionalism, but our emotionalism must not be shoved so far aside that our hearts become leaden.

The Jews have been the special focus of hatred for years, not only in Germany, but in Canada. Today in Europe they die like flies. But those who still exist have gone on realistically, crying in the wilderness of despair, yet looking always for a Moses. Because they have not completely despaired of deliverance, they have not perished as a people. Their Kingdom of Hope lives on, perhaps chiefly because they have shown themselves, since before the days of Mohammed, to be one of the great forces of mankind.

To date we seem to have taken the position that what happens to the Jews is none of our affair. We have thought in much the same way about the Negro. Only last fall, one newspaper (The Globe and Mail) pointed out that reports of racial discrimination in war plants showed some employers, and the government itself, to be forgetful of what this war was about. In June, 1942, it had been necessary

that (
of vin
ments
the el
practi
to do
It i
associ
Nazi

Octo

Refug

The cede

has fo

own |

and t

tion.
into C
and ac
the Je
tirely
Whi
with le

Malve

until
The C
two w
good t
refused
anese
must l
them i

cussion

distant
us beli
Here
of 194
ably e
employ
as to s
not wa
that w

employ perhap on the happer Selectiones himsel

At 1

small I partly mess he by lack over the for the find we power

Here willing on a swhite white warmber

and M

orum

I pur-

ve the

e con-

strial-

t total

y aim

pros-

ovem-

er the

es run

ly."

ed by

ictions

would

stry?"

estion

abicon

an be

more

eloped

atever

r, the

down

trans

e still

de on

prob-

r, be-

tance,

arter,

and

ill to

active

ed 50

years,

they

listic-

ways

ed of

King-

have

d, to

what

ought

ports

what ssary

for a delegation from the Canadian National Committee on Refugees to appeal to the Federal Government for action.

There are Canadians who, like the Germans, will not concede that it is simply the instinct of self-preservation which has forced the Jews, as a persecuted minority, to view their own problems with fervor, supported by a strong religion, and to intensify their commercial effort. The meagre help that Canada has given the Jews may be likened to the drink of vinegar given to the Christ. Why? Because most governments do not act until they have reasonable assurance that the electors will support them. As long as discrimination is practised by individuals, the government cannot be expected

It is true that the Canadian government was the first to associate itself with the United Nations' condemnation of Nazi brutality to Jews. Like the others, it promised retribution. It gave permission to admit 1,000 refugee children into Canada. But that is not enough. Thousands of children and adults should be welcomed, especially since we know that the Jews rarely, if ever, allow their people to be thrown entirely upon the state for care.

What is needed is a great cry from the people, coupled

with leadership.

As Canon W. W. Judd suggested to the recent Canadian Malvern Conference in Toronto, it is not necessary to wait until after the war to bring Jewish refugees to Canada. The Church of England alone could force the issue within two weeks if the call went out from every pulpit. (It was good to hear Canon Judd score those Christian people who refused to help the Federal Government look after the Japanese moved from the west coast.) The Canadian people must be shown that their sins of omission will catch up with them in the post-war era. Any people which refuses to face the facts of racial discrimination in its midst will feel repercussions from the other side of the Pacific, not nearly as distant from Canada as the Mercator Projection would have us believe.

Here are some facts not too widely known. In the fall of 1942, National Selective Service in Toronto (and presumably elsewhere) used a card for registering the needs of employers. On that card were these words: "Requirements as to skill, age, race." If any employer declared that he did not want a Jew, a Negro, a Roman Catholic or a Protestant, that was listed, and Selective Service workers heeded the employer's wishes. But one day a clerk slipped. He (or she) perhaps in an excess of zeal, enquired whether the employer on the phone had "any special requirements." The employer appened to be of a minority group. The lid was off. The Selective Service employee was on the carpet. This story comes from a NSS official of a minority religion, who was himself fighting discrimination.

At the same time the Jews were facing difficulties. The small businesses in which Jews engage were being pinched, partly because of the refusal of many Christian-owned busiless houses to deal with them. Some were being curtailed by lack of goods and manpower. There was no complaint over the necessary moves by Selective Service. Jews ineligible for the armed forces faced the possibility of being unable to and work because of discrimination in industry. The man-power shortage was front page news in Ontario. The Globe and Mail broke the story of discrimination. Letters to the editor poured in. A survey was made.

Here are some of the facts disclosed: One industry was villing to employ Negroes if necessary; another would insist on a separate department for them; several claimed that white workers would object; some offered to take a limited number of Negroes; one whole locality boasted it did not

welcome Negroes; one Toronto business man was reported to have boasted that he employed only people of a certain

The Negroes acted. The story spread. There was a buzz in certain official circles. On October 28, 1943, the Negroes' statement in the Globe and Mail said: "Some of us, even those of us who have university educations, are finding doors closed on us, even in wartime. We have supported the war effort; we want to help more. Our people have been downtrodden, wasting their abilities at inferior work. Selective Service has been proclaiming that it must place workers in war jobs-in the jobs for which they best are fitted. We have many more such workers within our ranks capable of entering the front line of production."

In a few days, pressure (that seems to be the word) was applied to Selective Service. It is only fair to say that at least certain officials welcomed it-they may even have promoted it. The pressure came from the press, including the Globe and Mail and the Winnipeg Free Press, and from the Canadian Jewish Congress. Selective Service made the following announcement, as quoted by The Canadian Press of November 14:

Some employers continue to discriminate against certain classes of persons on grounds of citizenship, nationality, race, language, name, creed or color. Such discrimination impairs the war effort by preventing the most effective use of our total labor supply and tends, by developing well-founded resentment and suspicion, to defeat the democratic objectives for which we are fighting

No official of Selective Service shall do anything to encourage or facilitate any such discrimination, viz., no such official shall make any remark to, or ask any question of any applicant or employer that could be interpreted as condoning or suggesting discrimination in employment against any class or person and no official in selecting applicants for referral shall take into consideration any factor other than the applicant's ability satisfactorily to fill the vacancy.

Local and regional offices were instructed to stop using any employment or Selective Service form of questionnaire, other than those issued by the head office, which contains any question or indication of a person's race, creed or color, and no form with any such question is to be put into use without head office approval.

But did the Selective Service pronouncement have any real effect? One Negro pointed out that there still was nothing to prevent an employer from turning down an applicant on the grounds that he was unqualified, whether he was or not. The potential employee might spend days proving his case. The Negroes at a meeting told of case after case of discrimination. They pointed out that 4,000 of the 7,000 Negroes in Ontario live in urban areas, where they must look for work in industry or take very inferior jobs.

President Roosevelt has ordered that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defence plants or in government because of race, color or national origin. To support this, he has a Fair Employment Practices Committee at work. It took time for the F.E.P.C. to get Negroes into the Lockheed Vega Corporation in Burbank, and the Glenn Martin plant in Nebraska. The works manager of the Heil Company of Milwaukee had this to say: "The colored people are taking an interest in their work, and up to the present time there has been no friction in the plant because of their employment." (Post War World Council report on "Brother Jim Crow," by James Rorty.)

It will take time to open the doors of all Canadian industry to Negroes. But it must be done. There are dozens of cases to disprove conclusively the contention that whites and blacks cannot or will not work together in friendliness. Yet, that contention is still raised by many employers in Canada who are begging Selective Service for men.

0

Mi

har

imt

our

"sa

leas

nat

to v

that

luxu

200

don

env

syst

The

crea

and

very

duri

stirr

the

thou

In t

poet

takir

ber o

the '

the V

with

word

se ta

and t

stand

artist

entitl

of vi

Apro

age v

team.

home

near

The

tion.

mind

meloc

count

the w

kind

TH

O

1

#### **Books of the Month**

SOCIAL SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION IN CANADA: Harry M. Cassidy; Ryerson; pp. x, 197; paper \$2.00, cloth \$2.50.

"This book has been written to make a plea for a plan," says Dr. Cassidy, "and at the same time to give a preliminary sketch of what a full-fledged program would look like." Both the plea and the sketch are the most convincing this reviewer has ever seen. Just as no one can talk authoritatively about Dominion-provincial relations who has not read the Sirois Report, so it may be said now that no one can appreciate the possibilities and limitations on social security work in Canada who has not read this study.

Dr. Cassidy relates the problem of social security directly to the war effort. He points out how the failure of the democracies to pay attention to the needs of the unemployed and indigent in the pre-war days undermined the morale of their people, and how a fear that these conditions may return even now weakens the popular faith in the purposes for which the war is being fought. "Plans for a great program of social security are long in the making and longer in the maturing," he reminds us. He wrote before the Marsh Report was published; but the way in which the Marsh Report has been allowed to remain a mere personal proposal of Dr. Marsh, without backing of either the James Committee or the Government, bears out every word of this warning. After years of work by the various committees on reconstruction Canadians have been offered nothing save a patchy draft federal health insurance bill that was not even presented to the House of Commons.

No review of a field so vast as that covered by this book can do more than refer to points of special interest. The structure of the book is admirable. The author defines the goals of social security, and establishes the standards by means of which any system can be appraised. He then holds the Canadian services up to these standards—with the general conclusion, which comes as no surprise, that "the liabilities outweigh the assets." In short, Canada is backward in its social services, not only as contrasted with New Zealand and Great Britain, but with many states of the U.S.A.

The next step is the analysis of the various proposals of the three major commissions that have investigated the field, the Archambault Report on the Penitentiaries, the National Employment Commission, and the Rowell-Sirois Report. Though appreciating the good work done by these bodies Dr. Cassidy does not hesitate to show where they have fallen short of what is required. Two of his major criticisms of the Sirois Report are that (1) it recommended that federal unemployment insurance should be supplemented by unemployment assistance-a principle since rejected in the Beveridge Report, and (2) it left too wide an area for provincial autonomy. There must, he asserts, be a balanced system of social services, and to approach the matter with the idea that there can be a sharp division of functions is wrong. "There must be Dominion concern with, and leadership in, all aspects of the social service field."

After examining some of the achievements and proposals of other countries, Dr. Cassidy then lays down a national program of social security for Canada. It deals with essential items such as social insurance, family allowances, work and maintenance programs, public assistance, medical care, public health, mental hygiene, child welfare, delinquency services and related services. He frankly admits that while the things

to be done for some items, like public health, child welfare, mental hygiene and delinquency are reasonably clear, there are other items where there are many questions about good policy. There is nothing dogmatic about his suggestions: wherever he is positive it is on the basis of experience widely known, and where doubt exists he explains alternative approaches.

The vexed question of jurisdiction over social services is dealt with helpfully on general lines. Dr. Cassidy is not a centralist in the sense that he favors the Dominion over the provinces. He takes each need and shows where it can best be met. He notes that there have been two concurrent trends on the administrative side: from municipalities to province, and from provinces to the Federal Government. It is wrong to think of there being a static amount of jurisdiction which is taken away from one authority and given to another; as fast as one duty shifts from province to centre a new duty may arise to occupy provincialists.

Social Security and Reconstruction should be read and studied by all students of these problems—and by all politicians who claim to be laying the basis for a new and better Canada. For this book gives, in simple language, real meaning to the term "freedom from want."

F. R. Scott.

SECURITY FOR CANADIANS: Charlotte Whitton; Canadian Institute of International Affairs and Canadian Association for Adult Education (Behind the Headline, Vol. 3, No. 6); pp. 20; 10c.

In Security for Canadians Miss Charlotte Whitton has written a pamphlet which contains a highly condensed outline of what social security would really mean for Canadians Miss Whitton is well-qualified to do this, and in the middle of the pamphlet she does it well.

The first three pages consist of sermonizing on "freedom of the soul and mind," as well as of the body. Here Miss Whitton is not in her element, and confuses cause and effect. This part of the pamphlet had much better have been left out entirely.

The latter part of the pamphlet, in which she deals with the economic issues involved in social security is also confused. But the middle part, a concise description of what social security for Canada means, is excellent. Thus the pamphlet is definitely like the curate's egg.

After describing the various phases of social security, Miss Whitton outlines the necessary approach:

- The maintenance at maximum production of the gainfully occupied population.
- The erection and maintenance of strong social utilities
   —educational, public health and welfare service—to prevent
   and reduce social break-down.

For actual break-down of social insurance and assistance, this is a good outline. In her account of the means whereby (1) can be attained, Miss Whitton keeps for a time on firm ground. She says if maximum production is to be maintained there must be a demand for the products; and that part of this demand must come from increased consumption of our present low-income groups. She points out that maximum production will require the state to "protect its resources, natural and human, from exploitation."

Then the author proceeds to ground less firm. The foregoing, she says, will require "the free play of individual enterprise to the attainment of the highest possible general well-being, instead of the maximum of personal profit."

orum

velfare,

, there

it good

stions:

widely

ive ap-

rices is

not a

ver the

in best

trends

vinces.

Wrong

which

ner; as

v duty

d and

by all

w and

e, real

cott.

Cana

nadian

dlines

n has

d out-

dians.

niddle

eedom

Miss

effect.

n left

with

COD-

s the

Miss

gain-

ilities event

ance,

ereby

firm

rined

rt of

our

num

rces,

fore-

dual

Miss Whitton says this will be required, but gives no hint how it is to be accomplished. The only free play of individual enterprise in Canada today is that of the monoplies, and it is absurd to suggest that they will operate for anything other than the accumulation of profit.

In her explanation of how social security will be paid for Miss Whitton finally bogs down. She says (page 15) "The hard inescapable fact in financing a national program of comprehensive security . . . is the measurement of the minimum living standard, that is compatible with the safety of our people. [Not the "happiness" or "welfare," but the "safety."] Then the cost of assuring all the people of at least that minimum must be calculated. The maintenance of the national income at that total level should be the basic national objective of our national striving."

This is a bleak prospect. Evidently Miss Whitton is ready to whittle down this minimum to a bare "safety" subsistence, and allow the great majority of the population to subsist at that level while a small minority will continue to live at a luxurious standard. Such a vision of social security is not good enough for Canadians. If that is the best that can be done under capitalism, the only system that Miss Whitton envisions, then Canadians are going to look for a better system.

Laura Jamieson.

NEW WRITING AND DAYLIGHT, SUMMER 1943: John Lehmann, Editor; Hogarth Press; pp. 180; 8s 6d.

This latest collection of Mr. Lehmann's is as notable as any of the previous ones both for vitality and for variety. The contributions are brief and numerous. There is prose, creative and critical; poetry of English and American origin and poetry in translation. The traditions exemplified are very diverse. In The Apple Tree, the reflections of an artist during an air-raid upon Petrograd, we have the direct, heart-stirring expression of emotion which has so long characterized the Russian novel; at the other extreme is an interesting, though rather stilted and labored, fable in Kafka's mode—In the Maze. The principle governing the selection of the poetry is obscure. One guesses that Mr. Lehmann began by taking the best he could find and ended by recalling a number of acquaintances who write verse.

On the whole, the critical prose articles are better than the "creative" stories and sketches. In French Writers and the War Raymond Mortimer discusses an important problem with sympathy, clarity and precision, reaching the conclusion that the silence of men of letters is more eloquent than any words: "La France n'a jamais plus beau visage que lorsqu'elle se tait." Among a group of articles devoted to the theatre and the dance William Chappell's Development of the Ballet stands out by its combination of expert knowledge and artist's vision. Derek Hill gives a brief and vivid sketch entitled Theatre in Peking.

The End of an Impulse, by Henry Reed, supplies a point of view from which to regard the verse that neighbors it. Apropos of the word "tomb" Mr. Reed points out that "an age which finds it an indiscriminately appropriate rhyme for team, bomb, therm, farm, limb, Shem, Ham, norm, climb, home and bum, as well as for the plurals of these, is getting near the point where reaction may be wistfully hoped for." The force of the italicized word is that of the whole quotation. Mr. Reed has also neat comment on "the absent-minded insertion of prose," "the disappearance of horizontal melody . . . accompanied by the disappearance of vertical counterpoint." It should be added immediately that even the weaker verse in this volume is strikingly fresh, with a kind of innocent craftsmanship, and that some of the trans-

lation is most skilful and satisfying, as when Mr. MacNeice renders into English Louis Aragon's Two Poems in Defeat:

I shall not ever forget the flower-gardens of France—
Illuminated scrolls from eras more than spent—
Nor forget the trouble of dusk, the sphinx-like silence,
The roses all along the way we went;
Flowers that gave the lie to the soldiers passing
On wings of fear, a fear importunate as a breeze,
And then gave the lie to the lunatic push-bikes and the ironic
Guns and the sorry rig of the refugees. . . .

Bouquets of the first day, lilacs, Flanders lilacs, Soft cheeks of shadow rouged by death—and you, Bouquets of the Retreat, delicate roses, tinted Like far-off conflagrations: roses of Anjou.

Roy Daniells.

#### CORRESPONDENCE

The Editor:

A young friend said to me recently when he was looking through a copy of The Forum "Do you like this poetry in The Forum? I can't seem to get much out of it. Guess I'm kind of old-fashioned regarding poetry—still like 'The lowing herd winds slowly o'er the lea' type of thing."

"That's funny," I replied, "only yesterday I read through the last issue of The Forum and I don't believe there was one line of prose in it I didn't understand or one line of poetry that I did."

Now this troubles me. For the fault may not be with the poets. Certainly I would not think of asking that all Forum poetry be written down to my understanding. That would be too much like demanding I give a satisfactory definition of the gold standard before collecting any wages. All I understand about finance is the small change. And it just could be there isn't any "small change" in Canadian Forum poetry.

This, however, does not quite remove all that troubles. Why it is that the older poets did write words and lines, and even complete poems, that had, for me, both meaning and music, must have some explanation, unless, of course, it is that these poets and myself are hopelessly dated.

From where I sit at the breakfast table in the kitchen, lines like the following can be read on a Scottish pictorial calendar:

"April has come to the isles again blythe as a lover, Shaking out bird-song and sunshine, and soothing the tides." Neil Munro.

or

"A mist of memory broods and floats,
The Border waters flow;
The air is full of ballad notes
Borne out of long ago."

Andrew Lang.

The scenes portrayed in this calendar and the verses complement each other simply and beautifully. Of some Forum poetry at times I have tried to relate the titles and the lines beneath them, and have invariably ended up by concluding the printer had, unintentionally, of course, got them all muddled up and, poor witless devil, was incapable of unscrambling them.

The Canadian Forum as a publication has a significant social purpose and, in prose, tells its story well. Its poetry, too, may have significance and may also tell its story well, but the undersigned is one Forum reader that has to take this on faith.

STEWART COWAN.

#### The Canadian Forum

SUBSCRIPTION RATE

One year \$2 Two years \$3

One year \$2 1 wo years \$5

THE CANADIAN FORUM
28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Canada

#### ON HAND

A limited number of these Labour Book Service choices please indicate second choice when ordering.

PLAN FOR BRITAIN—G. D. H. Cole, H. J. Laski and others.

WHAT HAVE WE TO DEFEND?-E. F. M. Durbin.

WAR BY REVOLUTION-Francis Williams.

SOCIALISM NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL—Franz Borkenau.

EDUCATION FOR A NEW SOCIETY—Ernest Green.
TEN ANGELS SWEARING—Francis Williams.



JUST ARRIVED

## **Our Soviet Ally**

Essays by Margaret Cole, Dr. N. Barou, I. Narodny and A. Steinberg. (Fabian Society).

Price \$1.10 each postage paid (90c to LBS members)

DEMOCRACY NEEDS SOCIALISM By Research Committee L.S.R.

65c Postage Paid

LABOR IN AUSTRALIA

The story of a successful labor movement Postage Paid

By Lloyd Ross, State Secretary, New South Wales

Branch Australian Railways Union

#### **Public Affairs Pamphlets**

15c Postage Paid

CREDIT FOR CONSUMERS DOCTORS, DOLLARS, AND DISEASE SAVING OUR SOIL MACHINES AND TOMORROW'S WORLD HOW GOOD ARE OUR COLLEGES? CO-OPERATIVES IN THE U.S. WHAT MAKES CRIME? LOAN SHARKS AND THEIR VICTIMS CHAIN STORES-PRO AND CON SAFEGUARDING OUR CIVIL LIBERTIES PENSIONS AFTER SIXTY? CREDIT UNIONS-THE PEOPLE'S BANKS MORE FOR YOUR MONEY GOVERNMENT UNDER PRESSURE THE CRISIS IN MANPOWER THE NEGRO AND THE WAR HOW TO WIN ON THE HOME FRONT WHERE CAN WE GET WAR WORKERS WORKERS AND BOSSES ARE HUMAN WOMEN AT WORK IN WARTIME THE AIRPLANE AND TOMORROW'S WORLD THE BEVERIDGE PLAN FREEDOM FROM WANT: A WORLD GOAL REBUILDING EUROPE-AFTER VICTORY

Order from The Canadian Forum Book Service

# Building a Better World

The real issue of this war is forcing itself on the consciousness of us all. Is the sole objective to be "victory"—or is the military defeat of fascism abroad to mean also defeat of incipient fascism at home?

Does "nothing matter now but victory"—or is there something still more important; namely, to see that this war ushers in the century of the Common Man?

If the latter, then you must be prepared to do your part in building a Canada which stands unequivocally for a people's war and a people's peace.

As an aid in keeping informed and alert on this issue and its various implications, we recommend that you become a regular reader of

#### THE CANADIAN FORUM

28 Wellington Street West, Toronto 1

Annual Subscription (12 Issues) - \$2.00

READ

# **NEWS**

YOU MIGHT LIKE IT

**Judith Robinson** 

**EDITOR** 

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS \$2 A YEAR

5c a week-on sale at newsstands

OFFICE: 63 WELLESLEY ST., TORONTO TELEPHONE RA. 5021

It's Out Now!

## Make This Your Canada

By DAVID LEWIS and FRANK SCOTT

Thousands of thinking Canadians have waited years for the first complete story of the new Canada which is to come, why it must come, how it will come. In 223 clearly and simply written pages you get the first full story of the C.C.F. Se important and interesting is this book that it is already a best seller. For earliest delivery send one dollar to

THE CANADIAN FORUM BOOK SERVICE 28 Wellington St. W., Toronto 1

